City of Bloomington
Common Council

Jack Hopkins Social Services Funding Committee Packet

Material for Initial Meeting

Thursday, March 1, 2007
11:45 a.m.
Council Library

Office of the Common Council
P.O. Box 100
401 North Morton Street
Bloomington, Indiana 47402
812.349.3409

council@bloomington.in.gov
http://www.bloomington.in.gov

City of
Bloomington
Indiana

City Hall
401 N. Morton St.
Post Office Box 100
Bloomington, Indiana 47402

Office of the Common Council
(812) 349-3409
Fax: (812) 349-3570
email: council@bloomington.in.gov

To: **Jack Hopkins Social Services Funding Committee**
Council members:
Mike Diekhoff, Tim Mayer, Andy Ruff,
David Sabbagh, Susan Sandberg, and
Representatives from Other City Entities:
CAC Member (Dr. Tony Pizzo) and a CFR
Commission Member (Hans Huffman)
Staff: Marilyn Patterson & Lisa Abbott (HAND)
From: **Council Office**
Re: **First Meeting of Committee on March 1, 2007, 11:45 a.m.**
Date: **February 21, 2007**

Contents of Packet

Memo
Agenda
History of Grants
Last Year's Council Resolution
Report of Last Year's Grants - Forthcoming
Summary of Interpretation of Last Year's Funding Agreements - None
Summary of Last Year's Program-Debriefing
Summary of Applicant Responses to Last Year's Survey
Criteria - Letter Outlining Criteria and Elaboration of Policies and Criteria
Solicitation Materials - Draft Solicitation Letter and Information Sheets
First Review of Applications - Cover Memo for Packet of Applications; List of Applications; Summary of Applications; Agenda
Presentation Hearing - Agenda
Allocation Hearing - Agenda, Request Sheet, Guide to Standardized Ratings, Rating Worksheet, and Final Ratings and Allocations
Sample Funding Agreement
Calendar for Months of March through June

Memo

Introductory Notes - Members of Committee

Welcome to the 2007 Organizational Meeting of the Jack Hopkins Social Services Funding Committee (Committee) - The Committee holds an Organizational Meeting each year to decide upon the process for making the year's Jack Hopkins Social Services funding recommendations to the full Council. The meeting usually lasts at least two hours, but hopefully, by focusing on the possible changes, we can get it done in an hour and a quarter (or if necessary schedule another meeting). This memo and the accompanying packet material provide a brief history of the program, outline procedures, and highlight some of the issues that should be resolved before the agencies are invited to submit funding proposals.

Date, Time, and Place

Thursday, March 1, 2007 at 11:45 a.m. in the Council Library

Composition of the Committee – Elect a Chair - The Committee currently includes five Council members and two members from other city entities. The five Council members assigned by the President are: Diekhoff, Mayer, Ruff, Sabbagh and Sandberg. As a result of a motion by the Committee at the end of the process last year, the other two members of the Committee include a person appointed by last year's Chair from membership in the 2007 CDBG CAC (Dr. Anthony Pizzo) and a person appointed by the Community and Family Resources Commission (Hans Huffman).

Action: *Elect a Chair*

History, Level, Source & Location of Funds

The Common Council established what is now called the Jack Hopkins Social Services Fund as an amendment to the Civil City Budget for 1993. The funding for 2007 has been increased by $10,000 and the history of funding is as follows:

Year(s)	Budgeted Funds
1993	$90,000
1994 – 1995	$40,000
1996	$50,000
1997 – 1998	$90,000
1999- 2001	$100,000
2002 – 2004	$110,000
2005	$125,000
2006	$135,000
2007	$145,000

Since 1994, the monies for this program have come from the General Fund. In 2001, the monies were placed in the HAND department at the same time that department took over the responsibility for monitoring the social service grants from the Community and Family Resources department.

Packet: History of Funding

Monitoring Previous Grants and Agreements – Last Year's Resolution, Monitoring Report, Interpretation of Funding Agreements, and Extensions

Marilyn Patterson will present her monitoring report regarding the implementation of the Funding Agreement for the 23 agencies who received grants in 2006. These grants and Funding Agreements were approved with the adoption of Res 06-06. In accordance with the Funding Agreements, the agencies either submit claims to the HAND department and are reimbursed for appropriate expenditures, or enter into an obligation for covered items and arrange for the City to purchase it by credit card or purchase order. Four Funding Agreements, which all involved operational costs, provided for the grants to wrap-up in 2007. Marilyn tells me that three other agencies sought extensions into this year as well.

The annual Resolution gives the Chair of the Committee authority to interpret the Funding Agreements, but no significant interpretations were made last year.

Packet: Res 06-06 (Last Year's Council Resolution)
Monitoring Report (forthcoming)

Action: Approve the Monitoring Report

Revisions to Procedures as a Result of Committee Comments and Agency Responses to Survey

The Committee held a Program Debriefing on June 7th and surveyed agencies later that month in order to evaluate the program and identify possible changes for this year. This packet, in some cases, proposes changes and, in other cases, merely mentions them for the purposes of discussion.

Copies of the Summary of the Program Debriefing and Survey are in this packet in order to refresh your memory about what we did last year and help you focus on what we should do this year.

Notes on the Survey: We received 16 out of a possible 35 responses to the Survey – from 14 who received funding, two who didn't, and one who didn't apply last year. The references to agency preferences later in this memo are based upon the 16 respondents and, in order to make the responses more clear-cut, count all "Not Sure" responses as against the stated proposition.

Packet: Summary of the Program Debriefing on June 7, 2006
Summary of Responses to Applicant Survey

Purpose and Criteria

Purpose/Criteria - The criteria for allocating these funds have remained substantially the same ever since Councilmember Jack Hopkins first proposed them in 1993. They are as follows:

* The program should address a previously-identified priority for social services funds (as indicated in the SCAN or other community-wide survey of social services needs);
* The funds should provide a one-time investment that, through matching funds or other fiscal leveraging, make a significant contribution to the program; and
* This investment should lead to broad and long-lasting benefits to the community.

The Committee approved a Policy Statement in 2001 that elaborated upon these criteria and other procedures and has since been revised.

Survey and Committee Comments

Survey: An overwhelming majority of responses indicated that the Criteria and Statement provided clear guidance in preparing an application. Two-thirds of the respondents said that the one-time funding requirement helped agencies implement their missions. However, some felt that the Committee did not apply the rule consistently for all agencies. *Note: Approximately 12 of the 23 awards included at least some operational costs. Of those 12 awards, approximately nine received about $50,000 for pilot projects (four of which were for amounts less than $2,500) and three received $28,000 for transitional or bridge-funding, which in total amounts to about 58% of the funding last year.*

Committee Debriefing: The Committee discussed the Criteria at the same time as the rating system, but spent much more time on the latter. In regard to the former, it affirmed the priority given to “emergency services” and “low income” populations (which were reflected in the Statement last year). Please see the *Ratings* and *Allocations* section below for your discussion on the rating process.

Packet: 1993 Jack Hopkins Letter Outlining Criteria
Elaboration of Program Criteria and Explanation of Procedures.

Proposal: Request grantees to include a one-page self- devised evaluation of the program (as opposed to equipment and capital) funds. Hopefully, this would give you more information about the effectiveness of program funds which took up half of the grants and about 58% of the funds in 2006.

Issue: Perennial matter of the one-time funding limit and the funding of operational costs for pilot projects or for bridge funding. While noting the importance of this issue, staff does not recommend any changes this year.

Solicitations – Submittals – Assistance with Applications

Extent of Solicitations – The Council Office informs social services agencies about this funding program by:

- sending solicitation letters to agencies that have received or requested letters in the past and relevant agencies that appear on the Bloomington Volunteer Network Newsletter;
- having the United Way mention the solicitation in their weekly electronic Non-Profit Alliance Newsletter and send e-mails to their member agencies;
- notifying the media through a press release and through the offer of Public Service Announcements (read by Chair of the Committee), and
- posting forms that can be down-loaded from our web page.

Survey Reponses and Committee Comments
Survey: Most agencies learned about the program through only one of the many means of communication; many were informed by more than one means; the most common means was through the solicitation letter.
Committee Debriefing: None

Submittals – The letter to the agencies invites them to submit a two-page statement indicating how much is being requested, what it would be used for, and how this request meets the program criteria. It asks them to provide a one-page budget detailing the use of these funds and a financial statement for the agency as a whole. It also asks them to fill out two information sheets: one requesting contact information and the other requesting proposal summaries. Typically, the letter gives the agencies from three to four weeks to submit their applications.

Assistance with Preparing Applications/Technical Assistance Meeting –
For the past few years, the staff has held a technical assistance meeting for agencies to attend and receive help regarding their applications. About two dozen agencies showed up for the session last year. The Community and Family Resources Department and HAND departments have also offered to help with the preparation of applications.

Survey Responses and Committee Comments
Survey. Agencies found the application process simple and easy.
Committee. No need for change.

Packet: Solicitation Letter
Program Funding and Contact Sheets

Assumption: Solicitation letter is adequate.

Assumption: The applications provide you with sufficient information to make a good decision.

Assumption: Staff provides adequate assistance to agencies when they prepare their applications.

Approve: Draft Solicitation Packet, dissemination plan, and technical assistance meeting.

Deliberations – Goals - Three Meetings

Goals and Procedures for Evaluating Applications

The following paragraphs set forth the goals and procedures for evaluating proposals and making funding recommendations:

Proposed Statement of Goals for the Hearings:

- Encourage applications that best meet our purposes by articulating clear guidelines and applying them consistently;
- Assure that Committee members make well-informed decisions;
- Support local social services programs by providing a positive environment when discussing and considering proposals; and
- Assure an efficient process that avoids unnecessary work.

Four Meetings to Make Recommendations – The Committee has met three times in the past in order to review the applications and make its recommendations to the full Council. At last year's debriefing, however, the Committee contemplated adding a meeting to discuss allocations before the formal allocation hearing. Those meetings include or would include a(n):

- Initial Review of the Applications *(new in 2004)*,
- Presentation Hearing,
- Pre-Allocation Discussion *(proposed for 2007)*, and
- Allocation Hearing (funding recommendations).

The following paragraphs briefly describe the activities that occur at each stage in order for you to decide whether anything should be changed this year.

Initial Review of the Applications – Becoming Familiar with Applications – Narrowing the Field - Clarifying Priorities The Council Office receives the applications (which have numbered from 20 – 35) and takes about 10 days to assemble, summarize, and distribute them to committee members and staff.

Since 2004, we have held a meeting to review applications about a week after you received the packet and about a week before hearing any presentations. This step provides an informal setting to share impressions early and ask questions of staff about the proposals and agencies. Last year, the meeting lasted about 3.25 hours and was conducted in the following order:

- notify the committee of conflicts of interest and declare ability to act fairly, objectively, and in the public interest,
- eliminate applications which were clearly inappropriate, and
- review the rest of the applications, raise questions for presenters to answer, and remove a few more from consideration.

In past years, the Committee also discussed:

- how to conduct public deliberation and inquiries, and
- its approach to allocation decisions (e.g. how to make that decision and handle partial-funding).

Survey Responses and Committee Comments

Agencies. The 2005 survey indicated that a majority of agencies would prefer that their application be cut before making a presentation if it was unlikely that they were going to be funded. This apparently was based upon the conclusion that they had better things to do with their time and did not see benefits in the form of a second chance at persuading you to fund their request or in the form of broadcasting their needs to the larger community.

Committee Debriefing: None. Typically the Committee has found value in sharing opinions and raising questions this early in the process. It eliminated eight of the thirty-five applications at this hearing.

Packet: Cover Memo for Application Packet
Summary of Applications
Agenda

Assumptions: Summary of applications serves your needs.

Assumptions: Order of business is fine.

Issue: Eliminating applications at the initial hearing allows you to cull clearly ineligible projects and also bring the number of presentations down to a manageable number. In the latter case, you would be concluding that those projects are just not a high priority for funding this year. Are there other criteria or other considerations you can articulate now regarding that decision?

Presentation Meeting – In the last few years, staff relayed your questions to the presenters and scheduled their arrival in waves. The 27 presenters were given five minutes to make their case with another five minutes to answer your questions. It lasted 2.66 hours.

Agency Responses and Committee Comments

Agencies. Approximately 75% of the agencies found the 5 minute presentation adequate. Some wanted better enforcement of the time period.

Committee Debriefing. None

Packet: Agenda for Last Year's Meeting

Allocation Hearing Recommendations - Resolve Questions and Adjust Allocation of Funds Last year the Committee members submitted ratings to the Council Office about a week after they heard presentations from the agencies. These ratings (on a scale of 0 - 5), comments (including proposed amount of funding) were then presented a few days later in the form of a table to Committee members. Soon after the ratings had been distributed, the Committee met for a third and final time to make recommendations regarding the allocation of funds. The challenge for the Committee at this hearing has always been to arrive at a method for allocating the funds.

Survey Responses and Committee Comments

Agencies. The ratings and allocations deliberations were the only areas where a majority of the respondents wanted to see a change. About two-thirds of them said the rating scheme was not clear, consistent, and equitable and a little more than half said the allocation hearing was similarly flawed. The comments said the Committee members were using “different modalities” and were “not on the same page.”

Committee Debriefing. After a good discussion, it appeared that the Committee favored holding a pre-allocation meeting where members could informally discuss their preferences and prepare for the formal hearing. Some suggested that the rating numbers include gradations of 0.5. Others suggested using the CDBG approach of applying a certain value to each criteria and summing the values to arrive at a total score.

Packet: **Agenda for Last Year’s Allocation Hearing**
Summary Request Sheet
Guide to Standardized Ratings
Rating Worksheet
Final Ratings and Allocations

Proposal: *Hold a pre-allocation meeting to discuss allocation decisions prior to the cable-cast meeting.*

Issue: *Consider adopting a 0 – 5 rating scale with gradations of 0.5 and with meanings attached to each number in order to help establish a more formal and uniformly-applied rating system. It was introduced last year as a suggested Guide to Ratings. It would set 3.0 as the minimum score for funding and, therefore, result in higher average scores. Another change would provide for 0.5 increments in scores. Are you interested in adopting this rating system? Please note that CDBG uses a point system for rating program requests and an aggregate dollar amount to decide physical improvement allocations.*

Issue: *Consider tying proportion of funding to level of ratings in order to avoid the "two modality problem" (i.e. ratings versus average allocations). This would mean agreeing at the pre-allocation hearing to fund applications with ratings of 4.5 or higher (or whatever score you choose) at a high percentage of eligible requests (perhaps 90% -100%) ; 3.5-4.49 (or, again, whatever score you choose) at a mid-level percentage of eligible request (perhaps 80%-90%); and 3.0 – 3.49 (or, again, whatever score you choose) at a lower percentage of eligible request (perhaps 70%-80%). This approach may work better with applications for program funds than applications for physical improvements and, given our lack of maximum requests, may unduly limit you in regard to large, highly rated requests. It will also not resolve funding to the penny, but will provide resolve questions about the connection between ratings and funding.*

Issue: *Partial Funding/Matching Funds –These decisions are often made without good information about how the adjustment would affect the feasibility of the project. How does the Committee want to address those situations this year? If you need more information from the agency, what will you need and when will you need it?*

Proposed Schedule - Traditionally the allocation phase for the program begins just after the CDBG funding is known (March) and runs to mid-June. Then the funding or implementation phase runs from July to December and sometimes into the next year.

Survey Responses and Staff Comments

Agencies. Two thirds of the respondents felt the June – December reimbursement schedule served their needs. A few respondents surmised that the schedule works well with requests for equipment and capital projects, but a longer schedule works better for reimbursement of program (operational) costs, where the grants often go into the next year.

Staff. The HAND department traditionally favors an early start in order to give agencies more time to spend their money before the end of the year.

Here are the critical steps in the allocation phase of the program and a proposed schedule:

Action or Meeting	***Action to be taken at JHSSF Meeting***
Council Office Solicits Applications	(By) Monday, March 5, 2007
Council Office Holds Technical Assistance Meeting	Thursday, March 22, 2007, 4:00 p.m., McCloskey Room
Agencies Submit Proposals (Deadline)	Monday, April 2, 2007, **by 4:00 p.m.**, Council Office

Council Office Distributes Application Packet to Committee Members	Monday - Wednesday, April 16 - 18, 2007
Committee Initially Discusses and Eliminates Some Applications	Tuesday, April 24, 5:00 p.m. McCloskey Room
Committee Hears Presentations	Thursday, May 3, 2007, 5:00 p.m., Council Chambers
Committee Members Submit Rating of Applications	Wednesday, May 9, 2007, noon, Council Office
Committee Discusses Funding Recommendations at a Pre-Allocation Meeting	Thursday, May 17, 2007, 5:00 p.m., McCloskey Room
Committee Makes Funding Recommendations	Monday, May 21, 2007, 5:00 p.m., Council Chambers
Agencies Complete the Funding Agreements	Monday, June 4, 2007, Council Office
Committee Evaluates the Program	Wednesday, June 6, 2007, 6:00 p.m., Council Library
Council Office Distributes the Council Packet	Friday, June 15, 2007
Common Council Action on the Recommendations	Wednesday, June 20, 2007, 7:30 p.m., Council Chambers
HAND Holds Technical Assistance Meeting	Tuesday, June 26, 2007, 8:30 a.m., McCloskey Room

Packet: Calendar for March through June, 2007.

Funding Agreements and Their Implementation - We require agencies to execute a Funding Agreement with the City in order to assure proper use of the funds. The Agreement describes the purpose of the funds and sets a time frame for spending the monies (which can be extended by the Director of the HAND department, whose staff is responsible for monitoring the agreement). The Agreement also requires agencies to repay the funds if the money is not used in accordance with the agreement. The HAND department implements these agreements on the part of the City either by reviewing claims submitted by agencies and reimbursing those agencies or by authorizing payment directly to vendors. The Committee Chair is authorized to interpret the funding agreement.

Survey Responses

Agencies. Agencies, on the whole, thought that the reimbursement system worked well and did not impair their ability to carry out the agencies' missions. One thought it created cash-flow problems.

Committee Debriefing: None.

Packet: Copy of current Funding Agreement

Proposal: Occasionally agencies seek reimbursements into the next year. This year a few will not be done in time for the Committee to request a reappropriation of funds in the event any are returned unspent. This year I propose putting a deadline of April 4, 2008 for the submission of claims. This would mean that the Chair of the Committee, and not the Director of HAND, would determine whether to extend the claims period beyond that date.

Evaluation of Program: For the past two years, the Committee met in early June to discuss that year's procedures and the agencies were given a survey of their impressions of the process later that month.

Proposal: Continue the practice this year.

Coordination with Other Funding Sources – In the past, the Administration and Council and others have taken various steps to coordinate the funding of social services programs.

Issue: Are there any steps the Committee would want to take this year or next year?

Agenda

Jack Hopkins Social Services Funding Committee

11:45 a.m. on Thursday, March 1, 2007

Common Council Library - Room 110, Showers Center, 401 North Morton

1. Initial Matters
    a. Introduction of Committee Members:
        1. Common Council
        2. Representatives from Other City Entities
        3. Staff
    b. Election of Chair
    c. Authorize the Council Office to act as Secretary for the Committee

2. History of Funding ($145,000 available this year)

3. Report on 2006 Grants (Marilyn Patterson, Program Manager, HAND)

4. Use Summary of 2006 Program Debriefing and Agency Responses to Survey to Review and Approve Committee Procedures for 2007

    a. Criteria - Review of Policy Statement
    b. Soliciting, Assisting & Submitting Applications
    c. Reviewing Applications, Hearing Presentations, Making Recommendations
    d. Proposed Schedule/Dates/Deadlines
    e. Funding Agreements

5. Other Business or Comments

6. Adjournment

History of Fund Allocations

JACK HOPKINS SOCIAL SERVICES FUNDING PROGRAM
HISTORY OF FUNDS

Year	Recipient	Purpose	Amount	Classification
1993				
	Public Health Nursing Assn.	New facility construction	$90,000	
		Total Year Award	**$90,000**	
1994				
	Middle Way House	Women's and children's transitional facility	$35,000	
	Rhino's All Ages Club	Larger facility for adolescents' activities	$5,000	
		Total Year Award	**$40,000**	
1995				
	Big Brothers / Big Sisters	Office Renovation	$4,800	
	Community Kitchen	Used vehicle to serve meals	$9,000	
	Girls, Inc.	Interior Construction	$21,700	
	Rhino's All Ages Club	Pilot outreach program	$4,500	
		Total Year Award	**$40,000**	
1996				
	Boy's and Girl's Club	Central Air Conditioning	$3,000	
	Dental Care Clinic	Dental Equipment	$1,450	
	Girls, Inc.	Van Purchase	$10,000	
	Head Start	Building and Program Materials; insurance	$4,400	
	Hoosier Hills Food Bank	Refrigerated truck	$3,800	
	Middle Way House	Child care facility	$17,350	
	Shelter, Inc.	Housing for homeless	$10,000	
		Total Year Award	**$50,000**	
1997				
	Community Kitchen	Transport containers to provide meals to at risk youth in after school programs	$1,300	

	Hoosier Hills Food Bank	Equipment for Food Repackaging Room for meal rescue program	$9,200
	MCUM	Addition and renovation of child care facility	$51,000
	Options for Better Living	Upgrading phone and voice mail system	$13,500
	Stone Belt Center	Primary network server for computer system	$15,000
		Total Year Award	**$90,000**
1998			
	Boy's & Girl's Club	Renovate and equip facility for a teen center and learning center	$23,000
	Community Kitchen	Purchase upright commercial oven, mobile sheet pan rack, and mats for kitchen floor	$4,675
	Evergreen Institute	Predevelopment costs for senior housing facility; any reimbursements to be applied to purchase of the property	$17,000
	Girls, Inc.	Purchase equipment to implement Operation SMART	$6,500
	Housing Authority	Insulate 8 buildings and purchase hand held carbon monoxide detector	$5,000
	MCUM	Renovate existing building to meet new building code	$9,925
	Options for Better Living	Repair 1991 Club Wagon for client purpose	$3,000
	Rhino's Youth Center	Operate Graffiti Clean-Up; salaries, operating costs	$10,900
	Shelter, Inc.	Renovate Campbell House for child care home; toys, furnishings, equipment	$10,000
		Total Year Award	**$90,000**
1999			
	Amethyst House	New Van	$10,000
	Community Kitchen	Ice machine and freezer	$4,650
	Dental Day Care	Dental chairs and equipment	$17,144
	Evergreen Institute	Residence construction for elderly	$8,208
	Housing Authority	Roof replacements	$9,300
	Head Start	Classroom equipment	$10,125
	Hoosier Hills Food Bank	Cooler and condensing unit	$14,394
	MCUM	Equipment for food area	$11,850
	Mother Hubbard's Cupboard	Refrigeration unit	$1,029

	Planned Parenthood	Exam table for handicapped	$5,000
	Shelter, Inc.	Training (conference) for new program	$4,300
	Stone Belt	Industrial sewing machines	$4,000
		Total Year Award	**$100,000**
2000 **June**	Abilities Unlimited	Equipment for loan to persons with disabilities	$3,498
	Center for Behavior Health	Floor covering for facility	$7,000
	Citizens' Advocacy Coalition	Training and printed materials for a one-to-one advocacy program for persons with disabilities	$1,500
	Community Kitchen	Eight dining tables	$2,460
	Housing Authority	Outdoor lighting at two facilities	$7,045
	Dental Care Clinic	To acquire used equipment	$7,000
	Family Solutions	To buy audio/visual equipment and software for parenting library	$714
	Girls', Inc.	For supplies and equipment for summer camp program and two car infant seats	$2,303
	Hoosier Hills Food Bank	One low-lift pallet truck and three sets of racking	$4,549
	Middle Way House	To construct addition onto their shelter	$10,000
	Middle Way House	To buy and install security devices for two facilities	$2,426
	Options for a Better Living	To buy materials, computer, and furniture for resource library for persons with disabilities	$5,000
	Stone Belt Arc, Inc.	For equipment and software for "compuplay" facility for children with disabilities	$11,500
		Total Award for June 2000	**$64,995**
2000 **Oct**	Abilities Unlimited	To purchase loaner equipment for persons with disabilities	$3,000
	American Red Cross	To convert a van to a mobile supply vehicle for disaster relief	$1,600
	Amethyst House	Rebuild foundation of Womens' facilities	$7,500
	Bloomington Hospital - Home Health Services	Implement a pilot healthcare program for local inmates after release from jail	$3,000

	Big Brothers / Big Sisters & Boy's and Girl's Club	To expand hours and activities for children at their Crestmont Site	$9,500
	Family Services - CASA	Hire staff for tracking services and measuring outcomes	$3,200
	Girls', Inc.	For the Friendly PEERsuasion Program	$2,500
	Girls', Inc. - Reading Renegades	For books, refreshments, and misc. equipment for after school reading program	$620
	Middle Way House	To buy an Industrial Grade document scanner for Confidential Document Destruction Program	$3,210.95
	Mother Hubbard's Cupboard	To establish a new southside food pantry in concert with the Community Kitchen and the Perry Township Trustees	$9,000
	Rhino's Youth Center	To construct a radio studio at center	$2,000
		Total Awards for October 2000	**$45,130.95**
2001			
	American Red Cross (Monroe County Chapter)	To purchase tables and chairs for community classroom	$5,100
	Big Brothers Big Sisters of Monroe County, Inc.	To purchase and install windows and doors for its facility	$8,779
	Bloomington Housing Authority	To purchase and install outdoor lighting for Walnut Woods complex	$6,502
	Center for Behavioral Health	To purchase counseling software for children	$1,639
	Community Kitchen of Monroe County, Inc.	To purchase equipment for second food preparation and distribution site	$10,721
	Hoosier Hills Food Bank	To purchase food for city residents	$3,000
	Middle Way House, Inc.	To support pilot childcare nutrition program/enterprise by paying salaries of cook	$23,885
	Monroe County United Ministries	To pay rent and utilities for city residents at risk of being dislocated	$32,884
	My Sister's Closet of Monroe County	To purchase display, tagging, and laundry equipment for clothing donation program	$1,130
	Options for Better Living	To purchase CPR training equipment to train staff	$4,966
	Planned Parenthood	To purchase equipment to test for anemia	$1,394
		Total Awards for June, 2001	**$100,000**

2002

Amethyst House, Inc.	To help rebuild and expand the men's facility by restoring the historic façade.	$20,000
Area 10 Agency on Aging	To purchase equipment for the Food Pantry at the Girls, Inc. site	$1,475
Big Brother Big Sisters of Monroe County	To purchase computer equipment for recruitment and training initiative	$3,623
Bloomington Area Arts Council/ JWAC	To purchase a raku kiln and other equipment for the art education program.	$2,895
Center for Behavioral Health (Children's Services)	To purchase equipment and fund 4 programs serving children and their parents	$3,952
Community Kitchen of Monroe County, Inc.	To purchase a copy machine shared with Shelter, Inc. and aprons, and hairnets	$3,639
Girls Incorporated	To pay for the salary of the director of the after-school and summer youth programs.	$15,000
Girls Scouts of Tulip Trace Council	To purchase 2 learning modules for the agency's Family Life Education Program.	$2,148
Indiana Legal Services, Inc.	To pay for the salary of an attorney as well as printing and publication expenses related to the new Housing Law Center.	$20,000
Mental Health Association in Monroe County	To start-up five new support groups and to publish an updated version of the directory of mental health services.	$10,192
Mother Hubbard's Cupboard, Inc.	To fund a new nutrition education program	$5,000
Options for Better Living	To purchase materials for a program between Options and Center for Behavioral Health to address persons with dual diagnosis	$5,000
Planned Parenthood	To purchase an autoclave for the purpose of sterilizing instruments.	$1,495
Rhino's Youth Center	To purchase audio and video editing equipment for after-school programming.	$8,264
Shelter, Inc.	To purchase new appliances for Campbell House	$2,317
South Central Community Action Program, Inc.	To establish a revolving loan program for auto repairs of clients	$5,000
	Total Awards for June, 2002	**$110,000**

2003	Amethyst House, Inc.	To purchase and install a stairway elevator at Men’s House facility	$4,521
	Area 10 Agency on Aging	To pay for 50% of the annual wage for the Food Pantry/Emergency Food VISTA	$4,614
	Big Brothers Big Sisters	To pay for Program Manager and program expenses for Girl’s Inc.’s Teen Outreach LEAP Program	$11,904
	Bloomington Area Arts Council	To pay for at least 50 scholarships for at-risk low-income city youth to participate in John Waldron Education Program	$4,250
	Boys & Girls Club	Job Development Specialist for TEENSupreme Career Prep Program	$25,000
	Citizens Advocacy	Preparation and distribution of a quarterly newsletter for Citizens Advocacy Program	$3,000
	Community Kitchen	Replace fire suppression system, loading dock, and 60 chairs for the S. Rogers site	$10,104
	Family Services Association	Purchase laptop computer, LCD projector, and carrying cases to promote activities, train	$3,000
	Middle Way House, Inc.	Purchase thermal carriers; pots, pans, and food trays; and, dishwasher proof dishes and flatware in order to extend program to Area 10 Agency on Aging	$4,100
	MCUM	Subsidize childcare costs for low-income households within the City	$20,000
	Options for Better Living	Pay for materials for its resource library and speaker fees related to the Family Partnership	$1,725
	People & Animal Learning Services, Inc. (PALS)	Purchase and install tow hydraulic mounting lifts to be used for and owned by the PALS therapeutic riding program	$3,400
	Planned Parenthood	Purchase four computers for its 421 South College facility	$3,600
	Shalom Community Center	Pay for six phone sets and install three new phone lines at its219 East 4th Street facility	$1,900
	South Central Community Action Program	Pay for the development of computer software	$6,292
	Templeton Elementary School	Pay for food and supplies for its Kinder Camp summer program to serve children entering kindergarten or the first grade	$2,580

	Total Awards for June, 2003	**$110,000**

2004

Big Brothers Big Sisters	Purchase a server, related equipment, and software to implement Phase I of its long range service plan	$4,500
Boys & Girls Club	Pay for salaries, transportation, and other operating costs related to the No Kid Left Behind Program	$8,000
Citizens Advocacy	Pay to print 4,000 brochures, fact sheets, and handouts, as well as approximately 500 informational guides to help recruit advocates	$1,180
Community Kitchen	Replacing a door and dishwashing machine, purchase a garbage disposal and kitchen grade metal shelving	$7,780
El Centro Comunal Latino	Purchase software, office equipment, and furniture for a central office & meeting space	$1,500
Girls Incorporated	Pay a portion of the cost of one used bus	$10,000
Hoosier Hills Food Bank	Pay for renovations to the facility	$13,294
Martha's House	Pay for salaries and operational costs needed to operate 28-bed emergency shelter & facilitate a new self-sufficiency & outreach program	$17,823
Mental Health Assoc/Family Services Association	Pay for computer equipment and a portion of salaries for a Jail Diversion Specialist – to find other means for handling non-violent, mentally ill offenders	$10,000
Middle Way House, Inc.	Pay a portion of salary and benefits for a Housing Specialist who will develop a cooperative housing program & facility for low-income women	$7,500
Monroe County United Ministries	To subsidize child care services for low-income city residents primarily during the summer months	$15,000
Planned Parenthood	To purchase 6 sets of cervical biopsy equipment	$2,923
Rhino's Youth Services	To purchase 4 portable 250 GB hard drives, a multi-media PC with monitor, and other equipment	$5,000
Shalom Community Center	To pay for a part-time Food Service Coordinator to expand its breakfast & lunch program as well as train & provide work experience	$5,500
	Total Awards for June, 2004	**$110,000**

2005

Big Brothers Big Sisters of South Central Indiana	Salary of Partnership Coordinator for a multi-year Capacity Building project	$5,000
Bloomington Hospital/ Community Health Education	Facilitator salary for New Parents Initiative for the third year	$3,000
Bloomington Housing Authority	Washers, dryers, vacuum cleaners and accessories, for Lice Program	$5,000
Community Justice & Mediation Center (CJAM)	Personnel, training, and recruitment expenses for constructive conflict resolution program for Black and Multi-racial youth	$1,400
Community Kitchen of Monroe County, Inc.	Replace produce cooler and purchase food trays for free meal service	$4,100
Habitat for Humanity of Monroe County	Two heaters and insulation for Habitat ReStore facility	$4,100
Martha's House, Inc.	Pay salary for Assistant Director and House Managers of the Emergency Shelter program	$12,500
Middle Way House, Inc.	Steel ramp, tow bar loops, lifts for Confidential Document Destruction	$10,000
Monroe County United Ministries, Inc.	Caseworker salary for Emergency Services program	$16,000
Options for Better Living, Inc.	Modify wheelchair accessible van for community participation program	$7,500
Planned Parenthood of Indiana, Inc. (PPIN)	Security cameras and equipment for the facility at 421 S. College Ave.	$1,500
Rhino's Youth Center	Construction of bathrooms and upgrade of heating and cooling system for Rhino's Youth Center at 330 South Walnut Street.	$22,900
Shalom Community Center, Inc.	Vertical lift for Shalom Center annex at 110 S. Washington St.	$9,000
South Central Community Action Program, Inc. Head Start	Furnishings, equipment and cognitive materials for Head Start classrooms at Templeton and Summit schools	$8,000
South Central Community Mental Health Centers, Inc.	Training, consultation and licensing for Functional Family Therapy program	$10,000
Stone Belt Arc.	Salary for a Curriculum Specialist for new Career Advancement program	$5,000
TOTAL		$125,000

2006

Amethyst House	To pay for property and liability insurance, utilities, food, and salaries needed to operate the Men's House at 215 North Rogers.	$8,000.00
The Area 10 Council on Aging of Monroe & Owen Counties, Inc.	To purchase IRis online software for the Go Live with 211 Infoline initiative.	$2,187.33
Big Brothers Big Sister of South Central Indiana	To reconfigure and repair the roof and restore water-damaged areas at 418 South Walnut.	$8,109.00
Bloomington Hospital Positive Link	To purchase portable hot boxes, portable coolers, and related supplies for the Nutrition Links program.	$1,150.00
Boys & Girls Club of Bloomington	To pay for staffing, supplies, food, and rent for the Crestmont Youth Camp.	$8,160.00
Center for Behavioral Health	To pay for car repairs and garage insurance for the Wheels to Work program.	$1,816.67
Community Justice and Mediation Center	To pay for printing a conflict resolution handbook, purchasing conflict resolution materials, and personnel expenses for outreach and instruction.	$2,170.00
Community Kitchen of Monroe County, Inc.	To purchase and repair a used van from Girls, Inc.	$8,401.64
El Centro Comunal Latino	To purchase a portable DLP projector and laptop and provide stipends for speakers for the Informate Series initiative.	$2,468.51
First Christian Church	To purchase two jumbo storage cabinets, an upright freezer, and supplies for the Gathering Place.	$1,250.00
Girls Incorporated of Monroe County	To pay for personnel expenses for a half-time Program Specialist and purchase Commit to be Fit support materials.	$1,950.40
Hoosier Hills Food Bank, Inc.	To install lights, replace door, reinstall floor scale, and purchase safety equipment for two trucks.	$6,670.00
Martha's House Inc.	To pay for personnel expenses for the Martha's House homeless shelter.	$8,000.00
Mental Health Alliance	To pay for personnel expenses for a Mental Health Community Coordinator and Office Manager and for the purchase of: resource guides, supplies, telephone expenses, travel costs, audit insurance, equipment leases and items for the Material Support Program (	$13,532.80

Middle Way House, Inc.	To pay for the personnel expenses of the Childcare Program Coordinator.	$12,000.00
Monroe County United Ministries	To pay for personnel expenses of an additional social worker for the Emergency Services program.	$20,000.00
Mother Hubbard's Cupboard, Inc.	To pay for the purchase and installation of one two-door freezer unit and one two-door refrigeration unit.	$6,670.00
Options for Better Living, Inc.	To format and rebuild computers and install modems and software as part of the Equalizing with E-cycling program.	$4,000.00
Pinnacle School (dePaul Reading & Learning Association, Inc.)	To purchase specialized teaching materials.	$4,394.67
Planned Parenthood of Indiana	To install cabinetry and purchase files and furniture for the front desk renovation.	$2,440.00
Shalom Community Center	To purchase a communication system and a technology system network that includes both server and software to be installed at 110 SouthWashington, Bloomington, Indiana.	$7,809.18
South Central Community Action	To pay for personnel expenses incurred as part of the	$2,230.80
Teachers Warehouse	To purchase shelving and help pay for overhead costs.	$2,000.00
TOTAL		$135,411

Review of Last Year’s Grants

Council Resolution Allocating Funds, Approving the Funding Agreements, and Authorizing Other Procedures

Report of Last Year’s Grants – Forthcoming

Summary of Interpretations - None

RESOLUTION 06-06

AUTHORIZING THE ALLOCATION OF THE JACK HOPKINS SOCIAL SERVICES PROGRAM FUNDS FOR THE YEAR 2006 AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS

WHEREAS, the Common Council established the Social Services Funding Committee (Committee) in 1993 to make recommendations to the entire Common Council regarding the allocation of discretionary social services funds and, in 2002, named the program in the honor of Jack Hopkins, who was instrumental as a council member in the establishment of this funding program; and

WHEREAS, according to Resolution 02-16, the Committee serves as a standing committee of the Council with five members from within the Council appointed by the President of the Council and with as many as two members added by the Committee from other city entities; and

WHEREAS, this year the Committee includes council members Chris Gaal (Chair), Tim Mayer, Dave Rollo, Andy Ruff, and David Sabbagh, along with Community Development Block Grant Citizen Advisory Committee member, Tony Pizzo and Community and Family Resource Commission member Shaunica Pridgen; and

WHEREAS, this year the City increased the funding from $125,000 to $135,000; and

WHEREAS, the Committee held a preliminary meeting on March 9, 2006 to establish the program procedures for the year; and

WHEREAS, at that time, the Committee clarified and approved a Policy Statement, which set forth and elaborated upon the following criteria for making their recommendations:

1. The program should address a previously identified priority for social services funds (as indicated in the *Service Community Assessment of Needs* (SCAN), the City of Bloomington Housing and Neighborhood Development Department's *2005-2010 Consolidated Plan* or any other community-wide survey of social service needs); and
2. The funds should provide a one-time investment that, through matching funds or other fiscal leveraging, makes a significant contribution to the program; and
3. This investment in the program should lead to broad and long lasting benefits to the community; and

WHEREAS, by the deadline at 4:00 p.m. on April 10, 2006, 35 agencies had submitted applications seeking approximately $268,000 in funds; and

WHEREAS, on April 27, 2006, the Committee met to discuss and eliminate applications from further consideration and on May 11, 2006, the Committee heard presentations from 27 agencies; and

WHEREAS, in the days following the presentations, the members of the Committee rated those proposals on a scale of 0 to 5; and

WHEREAS, on May 22, 2006, the Committee recommended funding 23 agency programs with ratings of 2.57 or higher; and

WHEREAS, the 23 agencies receiving funds understand the funding agreements, which have been prepared for each grant and agree to abide by the terms of those agreements; and

WHEREAS, the staff of the HAND department will arrange for the disbursement of the grant funds pursuant to the funding agreements, which will be interpreted by the Chair of the Committee; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BLOOMINGTON, MONROE COUNTY, INDIANA, THAT:

SECTION 1. The Common Council now allocates one hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars ($135,000) set aside for the Jack Hopkins Socials Services Funding program in 2006 to the following agencies for the following amounts and in accordance with the funding agreements approved in Section 2:

Agency	**Grant Amount**	**Purpose of the Grant**
Amethyst House	$8,000.00	To pay for property and liability insurance, utilities, food, and salaries needed to operate the Men's House at 215 North Rogers.
The Area 10 Council on Aging of Monroe & Owen Counties, Inc.	$2,187.33	To purchase IRis online software for the Go Live with 211 Infoline initiative.
Big Brothers Big Sister of South Central Indiana	$8,109.00	To reconfigure and repair the roof and restore water-damaged areas at 418 South Walnut.
Bloomington Hospital Positive Link	$1,150.00	To purchase portable hot boxes, portable coolers, and related supplies for the Nutrition Links program.
Boys & Girls Club of Bloomington	$8,160.00	To pay for staffing, supplies, food, and rent for the Crestmont Youth Camp.
Center for Behavioral Health	$1,816.67	To pay for car repairs and garage insurance for the Wheels to Work program.
Community Justice and Mediation Center	$2,170.00	To pay for printing a conflict resolution handbook, purchasing conflict resolution materials, and personnel expenses for outreach and instruction.
Community Kitchen of Monroe County, Inc.	$8,401.64	To purchase and repair a used van from Girls, Inc.
El Centro Comunal Latino	$2,468.51	To purchase a portable DLP projector and laptop and provide stipends for speakers for the Informate Series initiative.
First Christian Church	$1,250.00	To purchase two jumbo storage cabinets, an upright freezer, and supplies for the Gathering Place.
Girls Incorporated of Monroe County	$1,950.40	To pay for personnel expenses for a half-time Program Specialist and purchase Commit to be Fit support materials.
Hoosier Hills Food Bank, Inc.	$6,670.00	To install lights, replace door, reinstall floor scale, and purchase safety equipment for two trucks.
Martha's House Inc.	$8,000.00	To pay for personnel expenses for the Martha's House homeless shelter.
Mental Health Alliance	$13,532.80	To pay for personnel expenses for a Mental Health Community Coordinator and Office Manager and for the purchase of: resource guides, supplies, telephone expenses, travel costs, audit insurance, equipment leases and items for the Material Support Program (transportation and clothing vouchers, emergency medication, and related material).
Middle Way House, Inc.	$12,000.00	To pay for the personnel expenses of the Childcare Program Coordinator.
Monroe County United Ministries	$20,000.00	To pay for personnel expenses of an additional social worker for the Emergency Services program.
Mother Hubbard's Cupboard, Inc.	$6,670.00	To pay for the purchase and installation of one two-door freezer unit and one two-door refrigeration unit.
Options for Better Living, Inc.	$4,000.00	To format and rebuild computers and install modems and software as part of the Equalizing with E-cycling program.

Pinnacle School (dePaul Reading & Learning Association, Inc.)	$4,394.67	To purchase specialized teaching materials.
Planned Parenthood of Indiana	$2,440.00	To install cabinetry and purchase files and furniture for the front desk renovation.
Shalom Community Center	$7,809.18	To purchase a communication system and a technology system network that includes both server and software to be installed at 110 South Washington, Bloomington, Indiana.
South Central Community Action Program Head Start	$2,230.80	To pay for personnel expenses incurred as part of the Children's Door exchange program.
Teachers Warehouse	$2,000.00	To purchase shelving and help pay for overhead costs.

SECTION 2. The Council approves the funding agreements for these allocations, copies of which are kept in the Council Office and HAND department files, and directs the Office of the Controller to issue checks in the ordinary course of business to the agency once the staff of the Housing and Neighborhood Development Department submit a copy of the signed agreement and the appropriate purchase orders.

SECTION 3. The Council further authorizes the Chair of the Social Services Funding Committee to resolve any questions regarding the implementation of the funding agreements.

SECTION 4. The Council also approves the Report of this Standing Committee of the Common Council, which is comprised of the relevant portions of the packet memo and the related packet materials.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana, upon this ______ day of ___________________, 2006.

____
CHRIS STURBAUM, President
Bloomington Common Council

SIGNED and APPROVED by me upon this _______ day of ______________________, 2006.

____
MARK KRUZAN, Mayor
City of Bloomington

ATTEST:

____
REGINA MOORE, Clerk
City of Bloomington

SYNOPSIS

This resolution brings forward the recommendations of the Jack Hopkins Social Services Funding Program Committee. The principal task of the Committee is to recommend funding for local social services agencies which offer proposals consistent with program criteria. Over the last 13 years (1993 – 2005), the City has expended in excess of $1 million dollars to local social services programs and, in 2006, decided to increase the annual amount of funds from $125,000 to $135,000. The resolution allocates the social services funds to 23 agency programs, approves the funding agreements with these agencies, accepts the report of the Committee, and authorizes the chair of the Committee to resolve any questions regarding the interpretation of the agreements.

Last Year’s Evaluation of the Program

Summary of Last Year’s Program-Debriefing

Summary of Applicant Responses to Last Year’s Survey

Common Council
Jack Hopkins Social Services Funding Committee
June 7, 2006, 6:00pm
Council Library
401 N. Morton

Memorandum

In attendance: Chris Gaal, Tim Mayer, Marilyn Patterson, Dr. Anthony Pizzo, Dave Rollo, Andy Ruff and David Sabbagh. (Council Office: Dan Sherman and Stacy Jane Rhoads). [Absent: Shaunica Pridgen].

I. Introduction

Chris Gaal called the meeting to order. He opened the discussion Item One on the *Agenda*: a review of what worked well in 2006 and what warrants improvement next year.

II. 2006 JHSSF Program: Year-In-Review

A. The Allocation Process

Gaal and Mayer asked Dan if he had heard any feedback from agencies. He responded that he had not, but understood through Marilyn that many agencies were mystified by the allocation process and would like to see an approach to funding that is more consistent.

Marilyn offered that, in the course of CDBG monitoring, she received feedback from agencies who received 2006 JHSSF funding. For the most part, these agencies felt that the Committee made its partial funding allocations without regard to itemized priorities as ranked by the agencies. This criticism applied to those funded at the lowest levels.

Mayer stated that he feels that the Committee, as a whole, does not want to offend anyone and works to fund as many agencies as possible.

Sabbagh suggested that the blind approach of CDBG may be the more prudent method of allocating JHSSF funds. Dr. Pizzo agreed.

Dan stated: “Every year, there is a divide in the Committee between those who think they should fully fund a few agencies and those who want to spread the money around to as many agencies as possible.” From his perspective, deliberations look disorganized and messy this year.

Ruff said that he consulted many people who said the *Allocation Hearing* was not disorganized, but appeared to be truly deliberative and democratic. Mayer pointed out that the people Ruff consulted were not those who applied for funding.

Gaal clarified the information relayed by Marilyn: “People see us coming up with rationales for funding but the rationale does not have any relationship to their prioritized list and therefore, does not make sense.”

Ruff offered that the allocation process only looks disconnected if the agencies assume that the Committee will use the prioritized list to make partial funding recommendations. The Committee might want to use the itemized information in making decisions and providing such information is easy for agencies to do. He does not see the two as disconnected.

Dr. Pizzo stated that CDBG uses a 50-point scale to blindly rate applications. The JHSSF Committee could approach evaluation in the same way. CDBG employs five different categories, each of which is ranked 1-50, plus five discretionary points. Sabbagh stated that he is not convinced that using a scale 0-50 would make a difference.

Dan pointed out that the CDBG process might not work so well with JHSSF funding. With CDBG, just about all requests are exactly $25,000. With JHSSF, the amounts are variable and the Committee would likely know which agency they were ranking based on the amount requested -- the process would not be truly blind.

Dan also pointed out that the Committee referred to documents that were not available to the public, such as averaged allocations, individual rankings and Sabbagh's spreadsheet. This confused observers.

Dan further suggested that if the Committee cannot come up with a clean process for allocating funds, they should not do so on camera. He suggested that the Committee might hold a meeting after all ranking are submitted, but before the *Allocation Hearing* to discuss the best way to proceed. The public would be invited to this meeting. Then, on camera, the Committee could work through the process and spend the rest of the time talking about the applications, the decision-making process and could call upon the public to help meet the needs that the Committee was unable to meet. The Committee could really use the *Allocation Hearing* as an occasion to address something that is more positive and more related to social services needs, rather than spending the entire time working out the final penny.

Sabbagh pointed out that he proposed a spreadsheet of allocations. However, he did not see that any other Committee member came up with a proposal, a spreadsheet. Gaal said that many Committee members came to the meeting with proposals; they were just not in spreadsheet form.

Dan stated that last year, the average allocations worked better – Mike Diekhoff came to the meeting with a proposal that the Committee cut all applications below "3" and allocate the rest based on averaged allocations.

Sabbagh stated that partially funding everybody is not the best way to "get the best bang for your buck." Talking to people in HAND, he got the same impression.

Ruff pointed out that the Committee made several cuts before the allocation hearing and therefore, did not partially fund *everyone*.

Gaal summarized: "Dan is proposing that the Committee work out the process in advance. If we do that, then the *Allocation Hearing* becomes a formality, rather than the democratic, sausage-making process that Ruff liked. That is a tough way to do it."

Dan suggested that the Committee might also decide in advance which of the partially-funded agencies could actually implement their programs with partial funding. This would make for a more accurate and finely-tuned allocation process than in the past.

Gaal suggested that the Committee members submit their proposed allocations in advance. Ruff pointed out some provided this information this year. Dan emphasized that this recommendation would still not resolve the partial v. fully funding dilemma.

Gaal said that the response to those who did not like the process is "that there is just a philosophical difference of opinion on the Committee about partial v. full funding and if the process of partial funding was messy and did not reflect the itemized request made by the applicants, then this 'messiness' is a reflection of a philosophical divide in the Committee."

Dan suggested that the *Allocation Hearing* bears very little relationship to the criteria and he would like to know more about how the Committee makes its decisions. Sabbagh and Ruff clarified that the *Allocation Hearing* does bear a direct relationship to the criteria since all rankings are predicated on the criteria. Ruff said that ratings and allocations are directly related.

B. The Ranking System & Criteria

Ruff suggested that the Committee utilize a more refined, "half-number system" proposed earlier by Dr. Pizzo.

Mayer state that it would be helpful to have a CDBG-type system whereby, if an application meets a certain criterion, then it is granted a certain number of points.

Stacy Jane suggested that the Council Office tried to do that this year, with its *Standardized Rankings – A Working Guide*[1] and pointed out that the problem with such a scheme is that the Committee does not rely solely on the criteria to make its decisions -- it also relies on other factors, such as the context of all applications.

The Committee reviewed the *Standardized Rankings – A Working Guide* as submitted by the Council Office. Gaal stated that it was a good guideline and he tried to use it, but cannot say that he was always true to it in his ultimate allocations.

---

[1]

Standardized Rankings – A Working Guide

"0"	Does not meet any criteria and/or does not primarily serve City residents.
"1"	Minimally meets only one criterion and primarily serves City residents.
"2"	Minimally meets only two criteria and primarily serves City residents.
"3"	Minimally meets all three criteria and primarily serves City residents.
"4"	Fully meets all three criteria, primarily serves City residents and addresses one of the Committee's elaborated priorities (service to low-income residents or the provision of basic human needs).
"5"	Fully meets all three criteria, primarily serves City residents and both targets a low-income population and provides a service addressing basic human needs.

Dr. Pizzo stated that the Committee may need to expand the criteria and reviewed the CDBG process for attaching a number to a discrete criterion. Dr. Pizzo suggested that the Committee expand the criteria and quantify each one.
Dan asked what else entered into each Committee member's decision-making process?

Gaal explained that for him, emergency services ranks highly and should be made its own criteria. If a program addresses emergency services, then it should rank at least a "1." Also, he looks at whether the request is for bridge funding and if there is some "liability factor" that may compromise the success of the program.

Sabbagh echoed that he considers emergency services in ranking applications.

Mayer stated that prior performance should be a criterion. That was the major stumbling block for New Leaf – they are well-intentioned but lacked a business plan.

Sabbagh added that a well-established, successful agency bodes well in his ranking. JHSSF program has so little money to distribute, that he wants to make sure it will be used responsibly. He stated that he has full faith in established agencies such as Middle Way House, the Community Kitchen and Hoosier Hills Food Bank.

Mayer pointed out that such a strategy of funding only established agencies does not afford much room for new initiatives/ agencies.

Ruff asked: What sort of a track record did Mother Hubbard's Cupboard have when it first received JHSSF funding?

Mayer responded that the Cupboard did not have much of a history when it was granted funds, but that it asked for a modest sum to incorporate.

Dan asked how the Committee might handle duplication of services.

Ruff asked: "If [according to the *Rankings Guide*] anything below a '3' doesn't meet all the criteria, why are we funding the project at all?" The Committee discussed that it might not be able to allocate all funds if it eliminated all applications that ranked below a "3."

Rollo asked: "If some proposals were ranked '0,' why were they not eliminated early on?" The Committee responded that such proposals were not eliminated because there was not agreement that the application should be eliminated.

Sabbagh asked if the Committee ever decides not to spend all JHSSF money in a year and return a portion to the JHSSF fund? Dan replied that the Committee has always allocated all its funds each year, with the exception of a project that was funded, but not implemented.

Ruff observed that if the Committee is going to hold true to the rating schema, then it should make it clear to agencies than anything below a "3," will not get funded. Agencies should understand that if the Committee decides on a funding scheme that fully funds a few agencies rather than partially funding many, some agencies will not be funded.

Mayer instructed that the process is likely confusing in the minds of agencies because they compare it with that of CDBG. CDBG is much more formal and controlled.

Dan pointed out that this year was the first in which the JHSSF program has more money for social services agencies than CDBG. Comparing the two programs, which is more transparent, accountable and formal? He asked if the Committee still likes the criteria and if the criteria sufficiently get at the priorities of “emergency services” and “service to low-income populations.”

Dr. Pizzo suggested that the Committee could add these as these two priorities as distinct criteria, in addition to the current three.

Dan relayed that in last year’s survey, the Committee asked agencies if partially funding many than fully funding a few was prudent? Of the eight agencies that responded, four responded, “yes”; two responded, “no”; and two did not comment.

Dan asked if it would make sense to grant each criterion a weight, like CDBG. This might be helpful as some Committee members may grant emergency services more significance than others.

Sabbagh said Dan was making the process more complicated than it needs to be.

Gaal stated that the only way to remedy the problem of the *Allocation Hearing* is for Committee members to take a more active, engaged, approach.

Mayer pointed out that in the CDBG program, after members submit allocations, the Committee meets again with staff. Agencies can sit in on the meetings if they wish. It is public, but not televised. One of the rules of the meeting is that members of the public are not permitted to speak.

C. Adding a Pre-*Allocation Hearing* Meeting in 2007

Dan stated that the foregoing discussion raises two points: 1) The Committee should foster better communication between Committee member before the *Hearing*; (Mayer called this the “opaque” method); and 2) the Committee should formalize the communication/decision-making process with another meeting.

Ruff stated that the above point #1 is not transparent and is not practical – Committee members cannot reasonably make personal telephone calls to each of the other Committee members to discuss his/her rationale and strategy. A meeting would work better. Gaal reinforced that another meeting prior to the *Allocation Hearing* might encourage people to communicate better and render a few more proposals for allocations.

D. Application Presentation to Committee

Dan asked about other elements of the funding process. Did the Committee members like the way the Council summarized and bound all applications? All responded, “yes.” Sabbagh pointed out that he relies primarily on summaries, with only occasional consultation of the application itself.

E. Survey

Dan stated that the Office will send a survey to applicants again this year before the technical assistance meeting and asked for feedback on the survey.

Mayer said that the survey should go out directly after the *Allocation Hearing*. Sabbagh echoed that the Committee may get more responses if it sends it out soon after the *Allocation Hearing*. If the survey is sent closer to the time of the Allocation Hearing, the process will be fresh in people's minds and the Committee will realize a higher and more reliable response rate.

Dan stated that the Council Office strives to distribute the survey in a timely manner and to make the survey simple to complete. This year, the Committee might wish to include the option to just respond to an open-ended question to allow respondents a free-form space to offer feedback without going through the entire survey.

Sabbagh stated that surveys have limited value and asked if CDBG sent out surveys. Marilyn responded, "no."

III. Appointment of Two Non-Council Members of the 2007 JHSSF Committee

Dan pointed out that last year the Committee authorized the Chair to appoint the two non-Council members of the Committee. This saved the Committee considerable time as it did not spend time working out who was on the Committee before it begins its work. Mayer moved to grant the current chair the authority to appoint the two non-Council members to the 2007 Committee. Sabbagh seconded and all present agreed.

IV. Meeting *Memoranda*

Dan pointed out to the Committee that *Memoranda* of the previous four meeting have been prepared and suggested that the Committee grant the Chair the authority to approve the *Memoranda* once all have had an opportunity to review. Sabbagh moved and the Committee agreed to grant Chair Gaal such authority. The Committee will review the notes and give Gaal feedback by Wednesday, 14 June 2006. The summary for tonight's meeting will be prepared by 14 June 2006 and the Committee will have until 21 June 2006 to give Gaal their feedback.

V. Other

Dan reminded the Committee that the 2006 JHSSF Report will be considered by the whole Council on June 21 and that Committee members should sign off on the Report.

Dan also informed the group that Lisa Abbot will conduct the HAND Technical Assistance meeting on 27 June 2006 at 8:30 am in the McCloskey Room as Marilyn will be out of town.

Marilyn closed the meeting by making it clear that some who received partial funding were indeed very happy and who were greatly benefited by a partial allocation.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 pm.

2006 Jack Hopkins Social Service Funding Survey Results

1. Did your agency receive 2006 Social Services Funding?							
1b. If "yes" did your agency receive the full amount it requested or a portion of the request?							
1c. If you received partial funding, the amount you received will be sufficient to implement the project you proposed in you application.			Not Sure	Agree			Agree
2. My agency sought funds for: Salaries or operational expenses, Equipment, Capital Improvement	Equipment	Equipment	Salaries or operational expenses	Equipment	Equipment	Equipment	Salaries or operational expenses
3. These criteria provide clear guidance for drafting your application.	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Sure	Strongly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
4. The Committee's one-time funding requirement helps your agency carry out its mission.	Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree

Disagree	Strongly Agree		Agree
Salaries or operational expenses	Equipment	Salaries or operational expenses	
Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree

Disagree	Agree		Agree	Agree	Agree
training & curriculum	Salaries or operational expenses, Equipment	Salaries or operational expenses	Salaries or operational expenses	Salaries or operational expenses, Equipment	Equipment
Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

5. Please comment on the criteria and/or the Committee's application of the criteria.	The criteria are very clear and that helped me prepare the application. I like the criteria's focus on previously established needs and consistent funding of social services. The "one-time" funding requirement could be restrictive, because sometimes it's hard to just fund our basic operations and serve the clients who come to us. However, I like the flexibility this requirement contains: to help fund a new staff position or help an organization that's in a unique situation. It's also beneficial to have a funding source that will fund equipment purchases.	I thought the criteria were clearly described and referenced through the COC and SCAN. You linked us to both of those documents so there shouldn't be any confusion as to what was considered eligible a appropraite for funding.	It is good to have the specific criteria related to this particular set of monies. We can't always meet the criteria but it does make it easier to make a request if we do. :)	I feel that the one time investment was very confusing because past history shows the funding is used for salaries which I don't feel are one time investments. (however in many cases very valuable) Also the term broad and long-lasting community benefit is not also confusing because the long lasting does not apply to many of our most in need.	The criteria are very well explained and easy to understand. They were obviously created by people who have great experience with social service funding.		It appears that some members of the committee may have been advancing their own personal agenda in questioning and selection of those receiving funding, giving a pass to some agencies who are well connected while scrutinizing others.
6. This July-December reimbursement time frame serves your agency's needs.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
6b. If the current time frame for submitting application and/or receiving reimbursement does not meet your needs, please explain.			We do try to plan ahead for grant monies we hope to pursue so it is often that we will have other funds before we apply for Jack Hopkins.				

Orginally, the fund was for new initiatives. That was fine as a criterion, but the committee did not adhere to the criterion consistently, and, in fact, was very arbitrary in its decisions. That, of course, was a problem. Also, orginally, the fund was meant to provide large sums of money to really help make a big project happen. It required the committee to decide what the community's greatest needs were. That approach unraveled in year three, I think. As a starter of big projects, the approach suited me. However, like all the other agencies, we are having difficulty currently sustaining our core programs. It was nice to be able to apply for funds to help keep our services for children and youth going. We asked for less than we need out of consideration for the other agencies, and then we got less than we requested. So, of course, the grant amount was not suffcient. It is inevitable that when your agency doesn't score near the top, you wonder why	I think the criteria are clear and fine. I don't think the committee sticks well to the criteria. It seems that some agencies come to the Council for "bridge" funds every year, with the same story. It's my understanding that bridge funds would only qualify under extreme situations, not the same request year after year. Other than that, I think the criteria are applied well and fairly.	The grant is truly addressing and meeting a social service need in our community – to provide enriching programs and adult role models to at-risk youth living in low-income communities. We are able to provide a highly requested service to our families and members through this grant opportunity. We appreciate the grant's freedom to use funds for salaries and operations, which is critical in providing quality youth programming.	
...(since your agency is the best, most effective, most important and necessary agency in the world), and I do wonder why. In my opinion, the committee has failed to narrow its interests sufficiently. As a result it disperses some very small amounts of money-sometimes to agencies on the periphery (or not even) of SCAN identified needs. Middle Way House has been a fairly consistent recipient of Jack Hopkins funds and I am grateful for that. I don't think any of our requests have been turned down. So, my comments should be seen as a relatively dispassionate response to questions about the criteria and the process, not a as a complaint with respect to how we have faired. I think the committee should clarify its priorities and should set a lower limit on the amounts it awards per agency.		...We appreciate the grant's freedom to use funds for salaries and operations, which is critical in providing quality youth programming.	
Not Sure	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree
I think different uses would dictate different disbursement schedules. July to December disbursement is more consistent with the specific piece of a big project approach, where the funds are spent at once rather than over time. I applied this year, for salary support for a key staff position that is losing its funding and the disbursement schedule was problematic because I have to use the funds in conjunction with other government funds that have to be spent first.			

				The criteria seemed fine. As to the committee application of the criteria that is difficult to judge without being aware of the internal review discussions. Several that you eliminated I too would have done so based on the written criteria. But there was at least one not funded that surprised me.	I thought the process was very well-thought out. The information session was helpful and clear. The application was easy to complete. Staff support was exceptional. Thank you for making this opportunity possible!
Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1 yr. would be more appropriate then 6 mos. time frame			Fine timeline for equipment purchase. If funds are going to be given to support program facilitation it needs to be for 12 months. Anything less is quite difficult in providing services.		

7. The reimbursement requirement does not put undue obstacles in the way of the agency fulfilling its mission.	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree
8. Comments?		Being part of the Hospital, this system was not particularly difficult…although I can imagine it would be for other stand alone agencies.	This has not been a problem for our organization and I have heard that if it is "crunch" time that there is the possibility that the organization could use the city credit card to make eligible purchases.				
9. I leaned about this funding program via: Solicitation letter from the Council Office, E-mail as a member agency of United Way, Non-profit Alliance Newsletter, The Herald Times or other news media; and/or, Other. Please Specify:	Solicitation letter from the Council Office	Solicitation letter from the Council Office	Solicitation letter from the Council Office, Non-profit Alliance Newsletter	The Herald Times or other news media	Other-Just looking for fund on internet and found it.	E-mail as a member agency of United Way	The Herald Times or other news media
10. The application procedure is simple and convenient.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree
11. Did your agency attend the technical assistance meeting?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes

Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
This is more and more the case with government grants. It creates terrible cash flow issues. It also intimates a lack of trust in the agency. While I can almost see this when the funding source is very distant from the recipent, I cannot understand it at the local level, where the agencies should be known to the funder.			
Solicitation letter from the Council Office, E-mail as a member agency of the United Way, The Herald Times or other news media	Solicitation letter from the Council Office, E-mail as a member agency of United Way, Non-profit Alliance Newsletter, The Herald Times or other news media	E-mail as a member agency of United Way, Non-profit Alliance Newsletter, Other: familiarity with the City's grant opportunities	Other: CoB Staff member
Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Not Sure	Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree
					While it would obviously be nice to have the funds beforehand, from an accounting standpoint, this makes more sense. Many granting organizations operate this way.
Other: varies-would be helpful if consistnet approach to announcing besides newspaper	Other: word of mouth	Other: annual applicant	E-mail as a member agency of United Way, Non-profit Alliance Newsletter	Solicitation letter from the Council Office, The Herald Times or other news media	Non-profit Alliance Newsletter
Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Agree	Strongly Agree
No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

11b. If you did attend, please comment on the usefulness of this assistance meeting and offer any suggestions .		I thought it was all outlined very well in the proposal. The technical meeting was redundant but for those unaccustomed to writing grants, I can see where it could have engendered more comfort in the proposal writing.	Not particularly useful but we have received prior Jack Hopkins funds; may be more useful if major changes implemented or if organization new to Jack Hopkins.		It was very useful, especially when there was discussion over a previous application.		
12. Any suggestions for improving the application procedure?	I really appreciate the simplicity and straightforwardness of this application. It is a real treat for those of us who write grants to complete a simple application that is also fair and just asks the right questions. Thank you.	None			None!		
13. Every year, the demand for JHSSF exceeds the supply by 2 or 3 fold. Every year, the Committee is faced with the wisdom of fully funding a few agencies or partially funding more. In your opinion, partially funding many requests is more prudent than fully funding a handful, provided that the partially-funded agencies are still able to implement their proposed program with partial funds.	Strongly Agree	Disagree		Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree

My staff member attended, but she knew how the program worked before she went. Nevertheless, I seem to recall her saying the presenter was good.	It was helpful, even though we have completed the process several times already.	An additional technical assistance meeting would be helpful, closer to the application deadline to cover any questions/concerns.	
Disagree	Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

	Nice job—short and sweet with all the information we needed.				It was helpful and brief :) The examples on the overhead were very useful and clear.
tie to expected outcomes & benefits that are documented as community needs		We appreciate the ease of the application process!			
Not Sure	Agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree

14. This year agencies were given five minutes to explain their proposal and answer questions raised in advance by the Committee. Five minutes gave you enough time to explain your proposal and answer those questions.	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure		Strongly Agree
15. The Committee treated agencies in a fair and even-handed manner.	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree	Not Sure		Not Sure
15b. If you feel that the Committee did not treat agencies fairly, please explain.				The only question I was asked was about ordination of gay and lesbians, I had no prior knowledge of this concern on the part of the council, therefore I could not answer the question. I understand the significance of the question, but feel I should have been given a heads up prior to the meeting.			
16. The proceedings provided a positive environment for agencies to promote their mission.	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure		Agree
17. The rating scheme of 0-5 used by the Committee was clear, consistent and equitable.	Strongly Agree	Not Sure	Not Sure	Not Sure	Not Sure		Agree
18. The funding process used by the Committee at the Allocation Hearing was clear, consistent and equitable.		Disagree	Not Sure	Not Sure	Not Sure		Agree

Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree
Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Not Sure	Strongly Agree	Agree	Strongly Disagree
Not Sure	Not Sure	Agree	Strongly Disagree

Not Sure	Strongly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Sure	Agree
Disagree	Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Not Sure	Strongly Agree
lots of politics w/these processes- have seen this as goal on CAC which follows similar process	Some agencies went over five minutes so the meeting got to be drawn-out, maybe a buzzer would help.			The Committee tried hard to be even handed but there were those applicants that definitely went over the time allotment.	
Not Sure	Strongly Agree	Not Sure		Agree	Agree
Strongly Disagree	Not Sure	Not Sure		Not Sure	Agree
Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree		Agree	Not Sure

19. Please comment on the deliberation.		The deliberations did not engender confidence in the process for allocation. It didn't appear that the council members were on the same page. It was very disappointing to see the confusion at the end of the process as it felt that prior proceedings and care weren't valid. It also felt that some agencies requests were not fully considered since the council members were rating with different modalities.	It seemed that the deliberations should have taken place without agency representatives present, as the ins and outs are not clear to us (OK, not clear to me)(nor do I particularly want or need to know such details). If there are questions for agencies, they should be answered before the deliberations.	I have no knowledge of how our program was rated, so I don't know if the rating was clear, consistent or equitable. Likewise I am unfamiliar with the funding process used by the Committee so I cannot make comment on that either.	I am sure the delibertaions were fine, we were not involved however, because our application was not approved for further consideration.		
20. Please offer any other comments or suggestions.		I see the process improve from year to year and appreciate the effort the council puts into continuously looking at the allocations process and making the best decisions possible for our community.	Thanks for asking…		The grant committee and process was very thorough. I was impressed by the committee's ability to make decisions. I also found the follow-up very helpful. Thank you for your hard work!		

It is not clear to me how the proposals were rated, why one agency's need or proposed use was rated higher than another. I would also have to say that I am not sure what the committee members really know about the agencies. There are agencies that put out a great deal of effort with good results for very little money. Then there are agencies that put out a great deal of effort with good results for considerably more money. There are very complex agencies and there are simple agencies. There have never seemed to me to be an understanding that you can have an inadequate budget at $2 million and an adequate budget at $200,000. No one actually looks into how the agencies use their resources.	It seemed a bit haphazard this year. In years past, there was a cut off point and then they started at the top and fully funded several, than started partial funding. This year however, it seemed to be even more loose and subjective. It seemed that agencies farther down on the list received a higher percentage of funding requested than some of the agencies who scored higher. Maybe that isn't accurate, but it was all confusing and it sure seemed odd	Presentations may seem to be repetitive and contained in the grant proposal. Deliberations may make some agencies, especially those who are new applicants or understaffed, feel the pressure of competition.	The Allocation Hearing was painful. It was obvious that the members of the committee were all using different criteria and standards to rate agency requests. The 0-5 rating scale is flawed and should include partial ratings (4.5, 3.5, etc). I feel that the process would run a lot soother if all committee members were on the same page as far as how to rate agency requests.
There is never enough money for legitimate needs. Given that, I think it would be best if priorities were articulated by the committee, if those priorities were disseminated before applications were submitted, and if the priorities guided decision-making, in a clear and transparent way, so that there were fewer proposals to consider as the process moved forward. Criteria should include not just the needs to be addressed but characteristics of the agencies considered eligible to receive funding. For example, if the committee is ultimately going to reject a request because it thinks the agency is carrying too much debt, an acceptable debt load should be articulated as a criterion.		I would like information on ways to promote or say thank you to "Jack Hopkins" in a public presentation, i.e. an article in the Herald Times. I am wondering if there are any prohibitions or protocol to publicizing the grant money and what is used for. Maybe this information could be included in an email or mentioned in the technical assistance meeting.	5 minutes is not enough time for agency request to be fully explained and understood. 10 minutes would be much better. To accommodate for this extra time the day when agencies present could start sooner or be broken up into 2 days.

Someone can write a great application & not get funded as decisions aren't made on merits of project as written on application but who knows who, who likes who, in terms of agencies & causes they support. -others turn in lacking application but get funded anyway	Very thoughtful and careful—there was a good balance on the committee of different opinions.	I'm not sure about the usefulness of the presentations, but I struggle to come up with an alternate suggestion. I do feel like a more precise system for timing the presentations could benefit the process since the time available is limited and should be evenly distributed		There were 2 committee members that seemed to sometimes not understand/hear or comprehend the answer to a question but didn't follow up with another question. It seemed difficult for some presenters to be heard for whatever reason. I'd be interested to know the role played by committee members who didn't attend the entire presentation evening.	I watched the deliberations on tape. It is very difficult to allocate limited resources to a larger number of organizations. The weighting system makes sense, although I don't know enough about how the relative weights were assigned to begin with. Some members are more familiar with certain long-standing organizations, but may not be as familiar with others. The application write-up was probably very important to their discussions.
I don't know how to get politics out of the process. Need to have score for quality of project based on application content & another score for presentation & gneral merit in community.		I know that this survey is confidential, but it seems like you would receive more honest and useful feedback from agencies if it was truly confidential. For example, in our case, the first few questions make it very clear what agency we are.			

Criteria

Letter Outlining Criteria

Elaboration of Policies and Criteria

City of
Bloomington
Indiana

City Hall
Post Office Box 100
Bloomington, Indiana 47402

Office of the Common Council

16 February, 1993

To: Council Members
From: Jack Hopkins

Subject: Social Services Funding

Most of us have discussed the question of social services funding, either in the Social Services Committee (which has met twice) or individually. I would like to summarize the discussions of the committee so far, in order that we may act soon to take final action on the matter.

The committee reached a consensus on the following criteria to be used for choosing appropriate programs for funding in the 1993 budget year:

1. The focus should be on previously identified priority areas.
2. Programs or projects should be such that a one-time investment will make a substantial difference.
3. Priority should be given to projects or programs where investments now will have a positive long-term spillover effect (such as reduced susceptibility to other diseases, decreased absences from school, reducing lost time for sick child care, etc.)
4. Capital should be leveraged wherever possible by watching from other sources.

The Social Services committee concluded that the Community Heath Program meets all these criteria. Appropriation of the available 1993 social services funds for the Public Heath Nursing Association would enable the PHNA to carry out a drive for complete immunization of all children in Bloomington and Monroe County and enable the consolidation of three separate locations into one building, which would save substantial funds in the process. The possibility of leveraging the investment through Community Foundation's Lilly Endowment grant is being pursued. In addition, a substantial additional appropriation from Monroe County makes the Bloomington investment particularly timely and effective.

I would appreciate your comments before any final action is taken to introduce an appropriation ordinance for this purpose.

City of Bloomington
Office of the Common Council

Jack Hopkins Social Services Funding Program

Elaboration of the
Three Criteria for Evaluating and Awarding Grants
And
Other Policies

Elaboration of Three Funding Criteria

In 1993 Jack Hopkins wrote a letter to the Committee outlining a set of criteria for the use of these social services funds. Aside from referring to a more recent community-wide survey, those criteria have served as the basis for allocating the funds ever since. The following is an elaboration of that policy approved by the Committee.

1. **The program should address a previously identified priority for social services funds (as indicated in the *Service Community Assessment of Needs* (SCAN), the City of Bloomington Housing and Neighborhood Development Department's *2005-2010 Consolidated Plan* or any other community-wide survey of social service needs);**

"priority for social services funds"

The Common Council has used these funds for programs that provide food, housing, healthcare, or other services to city residents who are of low or moderate income, under 18-years of age, elderly, affected with a disability, or otherwise disadvantaged.

City Residency - Programs must primarily serve City residents. Individual programs have occasionally been located outside of the City but, in that case, social services funds have never been used for capital projects (e.g. construction, renovation, or improvement of buildings).

Low income - Programs primarily serving low-income populations are given a high priority.

Emergency Services – Programs primarily providing emergency services (e.g. food, housing, and medical services) will be given a high priority.

2. **The funds should provide a one-time investment that, through matching funds or other fiscal leveraging, make a significant contribution to the program; and**

a. “one-time Investment”

This restriction is intended to encourage innovative projects and to allow the funds to address changing circumstances. For those reasons, it discourages agencies from relying on these funds from year to year and from using these funds to cover on-going costs, particularly those relating to personnel.

Operational Costs

Such costs are not generally considered a “one time investment,” but will be eligible for funding in two circumstances: first, when an agency is proposing a pilot project and demonstrates a well developed plan for funding in future years which is independent of this funding source; or second, when an agency demonstrates that an existing program has suffered a significant loss of funding and requires “bridge” funds in order to continue for the current year.

Renovation versus Maintenance

Costs associated with the renovation of a facility are an appropriate use of these funds, while the costs associated with the maintenance of a facility are considered part of the operational costs of the program and, when eligible, will be given low priority. When distinguishing between these two concepts the Committee will consider such factors as whether this use of funds will result in an expansion of services or whether the need was the result unforeseen circumstances.

Conferences and Travel

Costs associated with travel or attending a conference will generally be considered as an operating cost which, when eligible, will be given low priority.

Computer Equipment

Generally the costs associated with the purchase, installation, and maintenance of personal computers and related equipment will be considered an operational cost and, when eligible, be given low priority. However, the costs associated with system-wide improvements for information and communication technologies, or for specialized equipment may be considered a one-time investment.

b. “through matching funds or other fiscal leveraging, make a significant contribution to the program”

In the words of Jack Hopkins, who originally proposed these criteria, investments “should be leveraged wherever possible by matching from other sources.” Agencies may demonstrate such leveraging by using matching funds, working in partnership with other agencies, or other means.

Applications from City Agencies and Other Property Tax Based Entities

> *Over the years the Council has not funded applications submitted by city departments. This appears to be based on the theory that the departments have other, more appropriate avenues for requesting funds and should not compete against other agencies, which do not have the benefit city resources at their disposal. And, while never clearly stating they were ineligible, the Council has also not generally funded applications from agencies whose primary revenues derive from property taxes.*

3. This investment in the program should lead to broad and long lasting benefits to the community.

“broad and long lasting benefits to the community”

Again, in the words of Jack Hopkins, “priority should be given to projects or programs where investments now will have a positive, long-term spillover effect (such as reduced susceptibility to …diseases, decreased absences from school, reducing lost time (from work) .., etc).

Funding of Events and Celebrations Discouraged

> *Historically the Council has not funded applications that promote or implement events or celebrations. It appears that this is based upon the conclusion that these occasions do not engender the broad and long-lasting effects required by this third criterion.*

Other Policies and the Reasons for Them

Agency acting as fiscal agent must have 501(c) (3) status

The agency which acts as the fiscal agent for the grant must be incorporated as a 501(c)(3) corporation. This policy is intended to assure that grant funds go to organizations: 1) with boards who are legally accountable for implementing the funding agreements; and 2) with the capability of raising matching funds which is an indicator of the long-term viability of the agency.

One application per agency

Each agency is limited to one application. This policy is intended to: 1) spread these funds among more agencies; 2) assure the suitability and quality of applications by having the agency focus and risk their efforts on one application at a time; and 3) lower the administrative burden by reducing the number of applications of marginal value. Given the benefits flowing from cooperative efforts among agencies, applications that are the product of the efforts of more than one agency will be attributed only to the agency acting as the fiscal agent.

$1,000 Minimum Dollar Amount for Request

This is a competitive funding program involving many hours on the part of staff and the committee members deliberating upon and monitoring proposals. The $1,000 minimum amount was chosen as a good balance between the work expended and the benefits gained from awarding these small grants.

Funding Agreement – Reimbursement of Funds –Expenditure Before End-of-the-Year

The Housing and Neighborhood Development (HAND) Department has been monitoring the funding agreements since 2001. In order to be consistent with the practices it employs in monitoring CDBG and other funding programs, the funding agreements provide for a reimbursement of funds. Rather than receiving the funds before performing the work, agencies either perform the work and seek reimbursement, or enter into the obligation and submit a request for the city to pay for it.

And, in order to avoid having the City unnecessarily encumber funds, agencies should plan to expend and verify these grants before December of the year the grants were awarded, unless specifically approved in the funding agreement. Please note that funds encumbered from one calendar year to the next cannot be reimbursed by use of the City's credit cards.

Solicitation Materials

Draft Solicitation Letter and Information Sheets

City of Bloomington
Office of the Common Council

To:	**Directors of Social Services Programs Serving City Residents**
From:	**____ Chair of the Jack Hopkins Social Services Funding Committee, Bloomington Common Council**
Re:	**Invitation to Apply for Social Services Funding**
Date:	**March ___ 2007**

The City of Bloomington Common Council's Jack Hopkins Social Services Funding (JHSSF) Committee announces that it is accepting applications for use of $145,000 in social services funds. This figure includes an added $10,000 dedicated by the Mayor and Common Council for the 2007 fiscal year. So far, the Committee has allocated more than $1 million to agencies who provide services to needy residents. In the past, the Committee has funded initiatives such as: construction of a public health facility, acquisition of land for a transitional living facility, fixing a collapsed foundation for a recovery program, equipment for a food bank, and materials for a teen parenting project.

The Committee is composed of five members of the Common Council and two members representing City entities. This year, the Committee's Council representatives are: Mike Diekhoff, Tim Mayer, Andy Ruff, David Sabbagh, and Susan Sandberg. Dr. Anthony Pizzo from the Community Development Block Grant Citizen Advisory Committee for Social Services and Hans Huffman from the Community and Family Resource Commission complete the Committee.

The JHSSF program allocates funds based on the criteria described below. It is key that any proposal satisfy these criteria if it wishes to be considered for funding. To be eligible, a program must:

- **Address a previously-identified priority for social services funding** (as indicated in the *Service Community Assessment of Needs* (SCAN)[1], City of Bloomington, Housing and Neighborhood Development Department's *2005-2010 Consolidated Plan*[2] or any other community-wide survey of social service needs). Such priorities include basic services (food, shelter or healthcare) or other services to City residents who are: low-moderate income, under 18 years old, elderly, affected with a disability or are otherwise disadvantaged; and

- **Propose one-time funding & fiscal leveraging**

  1. One-time investment in a social service initiative
  The Committee aims to encourage innovative projects and to address changing community circumstances. Therefore, an agency should not rely on JHSSF from year-to-year to fund on-going costs (e.g., personnel). In some circumstances, the Committee may fund an agency's operational costs where the agency seeks funding for a pilot project or can clearly demonstrate that an existing program has suffered significant funding loss and requires "bridge" funds in order to continue for the current year. Applications for "bridge funding" are not encouraged; and

  2. Leverage matching funds or other fiscal mechanisms (e.g., in-kind contributions, collaborative partnerships, etc.) to maximize JHSSF dollars; and

- **Make a broad and long-lasting contribution to our community**
  As co-founder of the JHSSF program, Jack Hopkins put it: " [P]riority should be given to projects or programs where investments now will have a positive, long-term spillover effect (such as reduced susceptibility to…diseases, decreased absences from school, reducing lost time from work, [alleviating the effects of poverty]…etc.). Historically, this criterion has excluded funding events or celebrations.

---

[1] http://www.bloomington.in.us/~scan/
[2] http://www.bloomington.in.gov/hand/block_grants/con_plan_final.pdf

Additionally, any application must also meet the following requirements:

- The program for which funding is sought **must primarily benefit City residents**; and
- The application must request a **minimum of $1,000** for JHSSF; and
- The applicant must be a **501(c)(3)** (or be sponsored by one). In the event the applicant is not a 501(c)(3) but is sponsored by one, the sponsoring agency must provide a letter acknowledging its fiscal relationship to applicant. (Know that the Committee may request further information about this relationship); and
- **One application per agency**. The Committee encourages cooperative efforts among agencies; however, know that these cooperative applications will be attributed to the lead agency, serving as fiscal agent.

How to apply

Any agency applying for JHSSF funds must submit an application package that includes the following:

- A **two-page proposal** that includes:
    - The Mission of your Agency
    - Nature of Project
    - Amount Requested
    - A description of how your proposal satisfies *each* of the above-listed criteria; and
- The attached **information sheets**; and
- **A simple program budget** detailing all funding sources for the program; and
- A **year-end financial statement** for the agency providing both fund balances as well as total revenue and expenditures; and
- Signed, **written estimates** should accompany all requests **for the funding of capital improvements**.

Deadline

All applications must be received by the Council Office
401 N. Morton, Suite 110, Bloomington, Indiana 47402
by
Monday, ____, 2007 at 4:00 pm

► ***No late applications will be accepted.***

Helpful Hints

- Consider attending the Voluntary Technical Assistance Meeting on Thursday, March ___, 2007; and
- Read the enclosed 2007 JHSSF Schedule for notable dates such as when applicants will be asked to present their proposals before the Committee; and
- Be prepared to enter into a *Funding Agreement* by June __, 2007 if recommended for funding; and
- Plan to spend the funds and seek reimbursements in 2007 unless you specifically request more time in the Funding Agreement; and
- Learn more about the Committee's funding criteria by reading the attached *Elaboration of Criteria and Funding Statement*, also posted at: www.bloomington.in.gov/council/funding.php

2007 JACK HOPKINS SOCIAL SERVICE FUNDING PROGRAM SCHEDULE

Notable Dates for Applicants

WHAT	**WHEN & WHERE**
Request for Applications issued	Monday, March __, 2007
Technical Assistance Meeting for Applicants	Thursday, March __, 2007, 4:00 pm McCloskey Room, City Hall
Deadline for Agencies to Submit Applications	Monday, April __, 2007 **by 4:00 pm** Due in the Council Office
Invited Agencies make Presentations to Committee *Attendance Mandatory*	Thursday, May __, 2007, 5:00 pm Council Chambers
Committee Recommends Allocation of Funds *Attendance Voluntary*	Monday, May __, 2007, 5:00 pm Council Chambers
Agencies to Confirm Terms of Funding Agreements	(by) Monday, June __, 2007 Council Office
Common Council Acts on the Recommendations	Wednesday, June __, 2007, 7:30 pm Council Chambers
HAND Technical Assistance Meeting Re: Claims & Reimbursements	Tuesday, June __, 2007, 8:30 am McCloskey Room

Assistance with Applications

The application process is designed to be as simple as possible. However, should you have questions you may call Daniel Sherman or Stacy Jane Rhoads in the Council Office at 349-3409. Marilyn Patterson, Program Manager in the Housing and Neighborhood Development Department is also happy to help prepare applications; Marilyn can be reached at 349-3577. You may also contact any of the Committee members at 349-3409 or council@bloomington.in.gov.

Sincerely,

_______, Chair
Jack Hopkins Social Services Funding Committee
City of Bloomington Common Council

Please note that application materials may also be found on-line at: http://bloomington.in.gov/council/funding.php

Jack Hopkins Social Services Funding Application

Program Funding Sheet

Lead Agency:

Name ____________________

Is the Lead Agency a 501(c)(3)? ☐Yes ☐ No

Address where Project will be facilitated or housed:

____

Name of Project Administrator: ____________________

Address ____________________

Telephone & E-mail ____________________

Name of other participating agencies, if different from Lead Agency: ____________________

____

Proposed Project:

Title of Project: ____________________

Total Cost of Project: ____________________

Requested JHSSF Amount: ____________________

Other Funds Expected for Project:

Amount	Source	Confirmed or Pending

Number of Clients Served by this Project in 2007: ____________________

Number of City Residents Served by this Project in 2007: ____________________

Is this a request for operational costs? ☐Yes ☐ No

If "yes," is the request for a pilot project or for bridge funding? ☐ Pilot ☐ Bridge

Funding Information:

Example:

Tables:	*5 tables @ $12.00 each*
Chairs:	*20 chairs @ $8.00 each*

Please note: Due to limited funds, the Committee often recommends partial funding for a program. In the interest of helping the Committee best decide how to distribute funds, please provide an itemized list of program elements, ranked by priority and their costs.

ITEM	COST

Claim Submission Date: (*check one*) ○ **July 2007 – September 2007** ○ **October 2007 – December 2007**

○ **Other Dates Needed - As Explained in Application**

*This form is available on our website at: http://bloomington.in.gov/council/funding.php

Jack Hopkins Social Services Funding Application

Agency Contact Sheet

Lead Agency:

Name: ______________________________

Address: ______________________________

____

Phone & E-Mail: ______________________________

Website: ______________________________

President of Board of Directors: ______________________________

Director Information

Director of Lead Agency: ______________________________

Director's Address: ______________________________

Phone & E-Mail: ______________________________

Presenter Information

Name of Person to Present Application to the Committee ______________________________

Address ______________________________

Phone & E-mail ______________________________

Grant Writer Information

Name of Grant Writer: ______________________________

Address: ______________________________

Phone & E-Mail: ______________________________

Please also include:

- **The Agency's Mission Statement in Two-Page Application Narrative**
- **A Simple Program Budget for use of requested funds**
- **A year-end financial statement that includes fund balances and total revenue & expenditures**

*This form is available on our website at: http://bloomington.in.gov/council/funding.php

First Review of Applications

Cover Memo for Packet of Applications

List of Applications

Sample Summary of Application

Agenda

City of
Bloomington
Indiana

City Hall
401 N. Morton St.
Post Office Box 100
Bloomington, Indiana 47402

Office of the Common Council
(812) 349-3409
Fax: (812) 349-3570
email: council@bloomington.in.gov

To: **Jack Hopkins Social Services Funding Committee**
From: Council Office
Re: **Packet of Social Service Funding Applications**
Date: April 21, 2006

35 Applications for Jack Hopkins Social Services Funding Grants With Summary Table Enclosed

We received 35 applications for the Jack Hopkins Social Services Funds by the 4:00 p.m. deadline on April 10th, 2006. This year we have $135,000 available for grants and a total request of approximately $268,019 from these agencies. This packet contains the: 1) cover memo; 2) table of contents – with applicant requests and total; 3) applicant requests – in order of amount requested; 4) summaries; and, 5) applications with most of the background materials *(please note that some of the inessential materials were not distributed in order to save space).*

Meeting to on Thursday, April 27th at 5:00 p.m. in the McCloskey Room to Discuss and Decide What Applications Merit Presentations

The Committee will meet on Thursday, April 27th at 5:00 p.m. in the McCloskey Room to share impressions about the applications, decide which applications merit presentations, and raise questions for them to address on Thursday, May 11th. Committee members should also disclose any conflicts of interest (see below). This would also be a good time to talk about how you will approach the allocation of funds and the information you need from agencies in order to make a well-informed decisions regarding partial funding of requests.

Conflict of Interests

Please be prepared to disclose any special relationships that you, your spouse, or dependents may have with any of the agencies seeking funds. The term “special relationship” is vague, but is intended to include those relationships that would give the appearance of impropriety if left undisclosed. In the past, members of the committee have disclosed those relationships at the first meeting, declared their intent to participate fairly, objectively and in the public interest given this relationship, and have participated in the relevant votes. The committee may adopt other restrictions on participation at this meeting. Please share your thoughts.

(Over)

Schedule ***(with Committee and Council Meetings highlighted in bold print)***

Action or Meeting	**Date, Time & Place**
Committee Initially Discusses and Eliminates Some Applications	**Thursday, April 27, 2006, 5:00 p.m., McCloskey Room**
Committee Hears Presentations	**Thursday, May 11, 2006, 5:00 p.m., Council Chambers**
Committee Members Submit Rating of Applications	**Wednesday, May 17, 2006, Noon.**
Committee Makes Funding Recommendations	**Monday, May 22, 2006, 5:00 p.m., Council Chambers**
Committee Evaluates the Program	**Wednesday, June 7, 2006, Council Office**
Agencies Complete the Funding Agreements	Monday, June 12, 2006, Council Office
Council Office Distributes the Council Packet	Friday, June 16, 2006
Common Council Action on the Recommendations	**Wednesday, June 21, 2006, 7:30 p.m., Council Chambers**
HAND Holds Technical Assistance Meeting	Tuesday, June 27, 2006 at 8:30 a.m. in the McCloskey Room

Index of Applicants

Page Number	Agency	Project Request
1	1. American Red Cross -- Monroe County Chapter	5,000.00
9	2. Amethyst House	20,000.00
17	3. The Area 10 Council on Aging of Monroe & Owen	3, 408.00
37	4. Aurora Alternative High School	6,993.00
49	5. Big Brothers Big Sister of South Central Indiana	10,137.00
63	6. Bloomington Hospital Positive Link	1,150.00
79	7. Boys & Girls Club of Bloomington	8,160.00
89	8. Boxcar Books and Community Center Inc.	1,937.90
97	9. Catholic Charities Bloomington	4,800.00
105	10. Center for Behavioral Health	2,500.00
113	11. Community Justice and Mediation Center	4,920.00
121	12. Community Kitchen of Monroe County, Inc.	8,401.64
129	13. El Centro Comunal Latino	3,900.00
135	14. First Christian Church	3,244.00
153	15. First United Church	10,020.00
163	16. Girls Incorporated of Monroe County	2,438.00
173	17. Girls Scouts of Tulip Trace Council, Inc. and Monroe	4,071.00
179	18. Hoosier Hills Food Bank, Inc.	6,670.00
193	19. Martha's House Inc.	10, 000.00
201	20. Mental Health Alliance	16,916.00
213	21. Middle Way House, Inc.	15,000.00
225	22. Monroe County Public Library MCPL	5,000.00
239	23. Monroe County United Ministries	20, 000.00
249	24. Mother Hubbard's Cupboard	6,670.00
259	25. New Leaf-New Life, Inc.	23,000.00
265	26. Options for Better Living, Inc.	5,000.00
275	27. Bloomington Day Care Corp. (DBA) Penny Lane	19,760.00
289	28. People and Animal Learning Services, Inc. (PALS)	1,435.00
303	29. Pinnacle School (dePaul Reading & Learning	8,919.00
311	30. Planned Parenthood of Indiana	3,050.00
323	31. Salvation Army	7,824.00
335	32. Shalom Community Center	7,809.18
345	33. Stepping Stones, Inc.	4,598.00
351	34. SCCAP Head Start	2,788.50
365	35. Teacher's Warehouse	2,500.00
	Total Amounts Requested	**268,019.00**

# 1 AMERICAN RED CROSS – MONROE COUNTY CHAPTER

Project **Disaster: Food, Shelter & Clothing**

City Residents Served. 15 (of 30).

Mission

The American Red Cross (ARC) is a volunteer, international, humanitarian organization, which helps people prevent, prepare for and respond to emergencies. It is the only non-governmental agency given responsibility under federal, state, and local emergency plans to respond to emergencies and natural disasters. The local chapter has worked continuously since 1917 and provides services such as food, shelter, and clothing for families involved in fires, floods, storms and tornadoes. Through these services ARC offers hope in time of desperate need.

Project

ARC requests $5,000 in bridge-funding to provide vouchers to purchase new clothing, groceries, lodging, essential medications, bedding, furnishings, and other items to households faced with fires, natural disasters, and other emergencies. This amount would provide a week's worth of necessities for 30 individuals (@ $166 per person) or for five families of four persons (@ $950 per family). (See Program Budget for the kind, price, and guidelines for use of these items.) ARC requests this bridge-funding because their regular donors have redirected their usual local contributions to help with a series of well-known disasters handled by the national and international divisions. This diversion of anticipated revenues led to a shortfall of $25,000 in 2005, which should be recovered in future years when donations return to prior levels.

Criteria

Need. The SCAN identifies the need for providing shelter, food and clothing in the event of a fire or natural disaster and acknowledges the services provided by ARC at those times.
One-Time Investment. This is a request for bridge-funding, which is explained above. (See Project)
Fiscal Leveraging. This organization is largely funded through donations and operates with the help of many volunteers.
Broad and Long-Lasting Benefits. ARC provides immediate assistance to victims of disasters which alleviates the initial trauma and makes it easier for them to restore their disrupted lives.

Cost

Total Project Cost	$5,000
Amount Requested	
Standardized Emergency Assistance Package includes food/groceries, clothing and shoes, cleaning and laundry supplies, toiletries, minor building repairs and lodging *This investment would serve 30 individual clients @ $166 / client or approximately 5 families for a week @ $950/family*	$5,000
TOTAL AMOUNT REQUESTED	**$5,000**

SSF Funding History

1996	Denied	1 Day Intensive CPR Training	
1996	Denied	Station Wagon	
2000-Oct.	Granted	To convert a van to a mobile supply vehicle for disaster relief	$1,600
2001	Granted	To purchase tables and chairs for community classroom	$5,100
2004	Denied	Cabinet, health and safety equipment	
2005	Denied	Lighting and electrical renovation	

AGENDA

JACK HOPKINS SOCIAL SERVICES FUNDING COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMON COUNCIL
REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS
PRIOR TO PRESENTATION HEARING

April 27, 2006
5:00 p.m.
McCloskey Room

1. Introductions
2. Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest
3. Review of Applications (Summary Sheet)
4. Initial Elimination of Applications
5. Discussion of Remaining Applications
6. Date of Presentations
    - May 11th
7. Other Business
8. Adjournment

Presentation Hearing

Agenda

AGENDA

THE JACK HOPKINS SOCIAL SERVICES FUNDING COMMITTEE OF THE COMMON COUNCIL

11 MAY 2006, 5:00 PM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS

AGENCY PRESENTATIONS

- **Introduction**
- **Order of Presentations**
  (Kindly note: Each agency is permitted 5 minutes to present its application.)

  1 Monroe County United Ministries (Rebecca Stanze)
  2 Mother Hubbard’s Cupboard (Libby Yarnelle)
  3 Amethyst House (Tom Cox)
  4 Center for Behavioral Health (Cindi Skoog)
  5 The Area 10 Agency on Aging (Jason Carnes)
  6 Big Brothers Big Sisters of South Central Indiana (Liz Grenat)
  7 Bloomington Hospital Positive Link (Karen Danielson)
  8 Boys & Girls Club (Rebecca Linehan & Joe Stebbins)
  9 Community Justice and Mediation (Tina Nabtchi)
  10 Community Kitchen (Vicki Pierce)
  11 El Centro Comunal Latino (Tim Gonzalez)
  12 First Christian Church (Kathy Curry)
  13 First United Church (Julie Hill)
  14 Girls Inc. (Dorothy Granger)
  15 Girl Scouts of Tulip Trace (Deborah O’Brien & Marcia DeBock)
  16 Hoosier Hills Food Bank, Inc. (Julio Alonso)
  17 Martha’s House (Jodi Tobias)
  18 Mental Health Alliance (Donna A. Graves & Donald Weller)
  19 Middle Way House, Inc. (Toby Strout)
  20 New Leaf-New Life, Inc. (Tania Karnofsky)
  21 Options for Better Living, Inc. (Susan Rinne & Melissa Copas)
  22 Penny Lane (Kelly Sipes)
  23 Pinnacle School (Denise Lessow)
  24 Planned Parenthood of Indiana (Hannah Day)
  25 Shalom Community Center (Joel Rekas)
  26 SCCAP Head Start (Todd Lare & Dr. Billingham)
  27 Teachers’ Warehouse (Judith Witt)

- **Other Actions**
- **Adjournment**

Allocations

- **Agenda for Allocation Hearing**
- **Funding Requests**
- **Guide to Standardized Ratings**
- **Rating Worksheet**
- **Final Ratings & Allocations**

AGENDA

THE JACK HOPKINS
SOCIAL SERVICES FUNDING COMMITTEE MEETING
22 May 2006
5pm
COUNCIL CHAMBERS

FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Introduction
    - Summary of Agenda
    - Announcing Potential Conflicts of Interest

2. Funding Recommendations

3. Other Matters
    - Funding Agreements
    - Survey -- Your feedback helps shape the JHSSF program.
      Council Office will send electronic surveys in June.
      All responses are confidential.

4. Adjournment

2006 JACK HOPKINS SOCIAL SERVICES FUNDING REQUESTS

Agency	Request	Project
Amethyst House	$8,000.00	To pay for property and liability insurance, utilities, food, and salaries needed to operate the Men's House at 215 North Rogers.
The Area 10 Council on Aging of Monroe & Owen Counties, Inc.	$2,187.33	To purchase IRis online software for the Go Live with 211 Infoline initiative.
Big Brothers Big Sister of South Central Indiana	$8,109.00	To reconfigure and repair the roof and restore water-damaged areas at 418 South Walnut.
Bloomington Hospital Positive Link	$1,150.00	To purchase portable hot boxes, portable coolers, and related supplies for the Nutrition Links program
Boys & Girls Club of Bloomington	$8,160.00	To pay for staffing, supplies, food, and rent for the Crestmont Youth
Center for Behavioral Health	$1,816.67	To pay for car repairs and garage insurance for the Wheels to Work
Community Justice and Mediation Center	$2,170.00	To pay for printing a conflict resolution handbook, purchasing
Community Kitchen of Monroe County, Inc.	$8,401.64	To purchase and repair a used van from Girls, Inc.
El Centro Comunal Latino	$2,468.51	To purchase a portable DLP projector and laptop and provide stipends for
First Christian Church	$1,250.00	To purchase two jumbo storage cabinets, an upright freezer, and
Girls Incorporated of Monroe County	$1,950.40	To pay for personnel expenses for a half-time Program Specialist and
Hoosier Hills Food Bank, Inc.	$6,670.00	To install lights, replace door, reinstall floor scale, and purchase
Martha's House Inc.	$8,000.00	To pay for personnel expenses for the Martha's House homeless shelter.
Mental Health Alliance	$13,532.80	To pay for personnel expenses for a Mental Health Community Coordinator and Office Manager and for the purchase of: resource guides, supplies, telephone expenses, travel costs, audit insurance, equipment leases and items for the Material Support Program
Middle Way House, Inc.	$12,000.00	To pay for the personnel expenses of the Childcare Program Coordinator.
Monroe County United Ministries	$20,000.00	To pay for personnel expenses of an additional social worker for the
Mother Hubbard's Cupboard, Inc.	$6,670.00	To pay for the purchase and installation of one two-door freezer

Options for Better Living, Inc.	$4,000.00	To format and rebuild computers and install modems and software as part of
Pinnacle School (dePaul Reading & Learning Association, Inc.)	$4,394.67	To purchase specialized teaching materials.
Planned Parenthood of Indiana	$2,440.00	To install cabinetry and purchase files and furniture for the front desk
Shalom Community Center	$7,809.18	To purchase a communication system and a technology system network that
South Central Community Action Program Head Start	$2,230.80	To pay for personnel expenses incurred as part of the Children's Door
Teachers Warehouse	$2,000.00	To purchase shelving and help pay for overhead costs.

Standardized Rankings – A Working Guide

“0”	Does not meet any criteria and/or does not primarily serve City residents.
“1”	Minimally meets only one criterion and primarily serves City residents.
“2”	Minimally meets only two criteria and primarily serves City residents.
“3”	Minimally meets all three criteria and primarily serves City residents.
“4”	Fully meets all three criteria, primarily serves City residents and addresses one of the Committee’s elaborated priorities (service to low-income residents or the provision of basic human needs[1]).
“5”	Fully meets all three criteria, primarily serves City residents and both targets a low-income population and provides a service addressing basic human needs.

---

[1] SCAN defines “basic human need” as: emergency shelter, hunger relief and clothing, p. 55.

Jack Hopkins Social Services Funding 2006 Rating Sheet

Committee Member:

	Agency Name	Project	Request	$ Allocate	Comments	Rating 0-5
1	Monroe County United Ministries	Expansion of Emergency Services	20000.00			
2	Mother Hubbard's Cupboard	Food Pantry Program: Refrigeration Equipment	6670.00			
3	Amethyst House	Amethyst House	20000.00			
4	Center for Behavioral Health	Wheels to Work	2500.00			
5	The Area 10 Council on Aging of Monroe & Owen Counties, Inc.	Go Live with 211 Infoline	3408.00			
6	Big Brothers Big Sister of South Central Indiana	BBBS Building roof repair and reconfiguration project	10137.00			
7	Bloomington Hospital Positive Link	Nutrition Links: An Alliance of Caring Agencies	1150.00			
8	Boys & Girls Club of Bloomington	Crestmont Youth Summer Camp	8160.00			
9	Community Justice and Mediation Center	Restorative Discipline Resources for Students and Teachers	4920.00			
10	Community Kitchen of Monroe County, Inc.	Vehicle Purchase	8401.64			
11	El Centro Comunal Latino	Informate Series	3900.00			
12	First Christian Church	The Gathering Place	3244.00			
13	First United Church	Partners	10020.00			
14	Girls Incorporated of Monroe County	"Healthy Choice" Curriculum	2438.00			

	Agency Name	Project	Request	Allocate	Comments	Rating 1-5
15	Girls Scouts of Tulip Trace Council, Inc. and Monroe County Chapter American Red Cross	First Aid/CPR/AED Training Program	4071.00			
16	Hoosier Hills Food Bank, Inc.	Warehouse & Vehicle Safety Improvement Project	6670.00			
17	Martha's House Inc.	Homeless Shelter	10000.00			
18	Mental Health Alliance	Jail Diversion Program, Mental Health Community Coordinator	16916.00			
19	Middle Way House, Inc.	Childcare Program	15000.00			
20	New Leaf-New Life, Inc.	Inmate Transition Program	23000.00			
21	Options for Better Living, Inc.	Equalizing E-Cycling Program	5000.00			
22	Bloomington Day Care Corp. (DBA) Penny Lane	Subsidized Care For Families in Need	19760.00			
23	Pinnacle School (dePaul Reading & Learning Associations, Inc.)	Summer School Program for At-Risk Dyslexic Youth	8919.00			
24	Planned Parenthood of Indiana	Bloomington Health Center Renovation	3050.00			
25	Shalom Community Center	Facility Expansion at 110 S. Washington Street, Bloomington	7809.18			
26	SCCAP Head Start	Children's Door	2788.50			
27	Teacher's Warehouse	Teacher's Warehouse, a free store for teachers to serve the educational and creative needs of elementary school children in south central Indiana	2500.00			
		Total	230432.32			

AGENCY	REQUEST	RATING	FINAL ALLOCATION	
Mother Hubbard's Cupboard	$6,670.00	4.86	$6,670.00	
Community Kitchen of Monroe County, Inc.	$8,401.64	4.71	$8,401.64	
Monroe County United Ministries	$20,000.00	4.29	$20,000.00	
Bloomington Hospital Positive Link	$1,150.00	4.29	$1,150.00	
Hoosier Hills Food Bank, Inc.	$6,670.00	4.29	$6,670.00	
Boys & Girls Club of Bloomington	$8,160.00	4.14	$8,160.00	
Shalom Community Center	$7,809.18	4.14	$7,809.18	
Middle Way House, Inc.	$15,000.00	3.86	$12,000.00	
Options for Better Living, Inc.	$5,000.00	3.86	$4,000.00	
Big Brothers Big Sister of South Central Indiana	$10,137.00	3.57	$8,109.00	
SCCAP Head Start	$2,788.50	3.57	$2,230.80	
Mental Health Alliance	$16,916.00	3.5	$13,532.80	
Girls Incorporated of Monroe County	$2,438.00	3.43	$1,950.40	
Martha's House Inc.	$10,000.00	3.14	$8,000.00	
Planned Parenthood of Indiana	$3,050.00	3	$2,440.00	
Teacher's Warehouse	$2,500.00	3	$2,000.00	
Amethyst House	$20,000.00	2.86	$8,000.00	
Center for Behavioral Health	$2,500.00	2.86	$1,816.67	
Pinnacle School (dePaul Reading & Learning	$8,919.00	2.86	$4,394.67	
The Area 10 Council on Aging of Monroe & Owen	$3,408.00	2.86	$2,187.33	
El Centro Comunal Latino	$3,900.00	2.71	$2,468.51	
Community Justice and Mediation Center	$4,920.00	2.57	$2,170.00	
First Christian Church	$3,244.00	2.57	$1,250.00	
Girls Scouts of Tulip Trace Council, Inc. and Monroe County Chapter American Red Cross	$4,071.00	2.29		
First United Church	$10,020.00	2.14		
Bloomington Day Care Corp. (DBA) Penny Lane	$19,760.00	2		
New Leaf-New Life, Inc.	$23,000.00	2		
Total	$230,432.32		**$135,411.00**	

Sample Funding Agreement

FUNDING AGREEMENT
CITY OF BLOOMINGTON - JACK HOPKINS
SOCIAL SERVICES PROGRAM

«Agency_Name»

DRAFT

This Agreement entered into on ____________________________, 2007, at Bloomington, Indiana, between the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Indiana, hereinafter referred to as the "City," and «Agency_Name», hereinafter referred to as the "Agency," provides for the following:

Whereas, the Jack Hopkins Social Services Program Funding Committee (Committee) reviewed Agency applications, heard their presentations, and made funding recommendations to the Common Council; and

Whereas, the Common Council adopted Resolution 07-0X which provided funding to this Agency in the amount and the purposes set forth in Section 1 of this Agreement; and

Whereas, the resolution also delegated the duty of interpreting the funding agreement for the City to the Chair of the Committee; and

Whereas, in interpreting the Agreement, the Chair may consider the purposes of the program, the application and comments by Agency representatives, and statements made by decision-makers during deliberations;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE PARTIES AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

I. USE OF FUNDS

Agency agrees to use Agreement funds as follows:

«Project_Description»

«Other_Provisions»

II. TIME OF PERFORMANCE

The last claim for expenses under this Agreement must be filed before «Deadline». Upon request from the Agency, the deadline may be extended by the Housing and Neighborhood Development Director of the City for good cause no later than April 4, 2008. Said request must be submitted in writing at least two weeks prior to the deadline set forth the first sentence or as extended by the Housing and Neighborhood Development Director.

III. PAYMENT PROCEDURES

It is expressly agreed and understood that the total amount to be paid by the City under this contract shall not exceed $«Received». Claims for the payment of eligible expenses shall be made against the items specified in Section I, Use of Funds.

«Salaries»

The Agency will submit to the City a claim voucher pursuant to City's claim procedures and deadlines for the expenditures corresponding to the agreed upon use of funds outlined above. Along with the claim voucher, the Agency will submit documentation satisfactory to the City, at the City's sole discretion, showing the Agency's expenditures.

The Agency agrees to make its best efforts to submit claims on a monthly basis and also agrees to submit claims for its June, July, and August expenditures no later than the end of September and to submit claims for its September, October, and November expenditures no later than December 1, 2007.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS

A. Accounting Procedures

The Agency agrees to use generally accepted accounting procedures and to provide for:

(1) Accurate, current, and complete disclosure of the financial component of its activities;
(2) Records which identify adequately the source and application of funds for City supported activities;
(3) Effective control over and accountability for all funds, property, and other assets.
(4) Adequate safeguarding all such assets and assurance that they are used solely for authorized purposes;
(5) The City to conduct monitoring activities as it deems reasonably necessary to insure compliance with this Agreement; and
(6) Return of the funds received under this Agreement that the City determines were not expended in compliance with its terms.

B. Access to Records

The Agency agrees that it will give the City, through any authorized representative, access to, and the right to examine, all records, books, papers or documents related to the funding provided by this Agreement, for the purpose of making surveys, audits, examinations, excerpts, and transcripts.

DRAFT

C. Retention of Records

The Agency agrees that it will retain financial records, supporting documents, statistical records, and all other records pertinent to the funding provided to the Agency for a period of three years from the termination of this Agreement pursuant to Section VII or VIII.

V. GENERAL CONDITIONS

A. Independent Contractor

Nothing contained in this Agreement is intended to, or shall be construed in any manner, as creating or establishing the relationship of employer/employee between the parties. The Agency shall at all times remain an "independent contractor" with respect to the services to be performed under this Agreement. None of the benefits provided by an employer to an employee, including but not limited to minimum wage and overtime compensation, workers' compensation insurance and unemployment insurance, shall be available from or through the City to the Agency.

B. Hold Harmless

The Agency shall hold harmless, defend and indemnify the City from any and all claims, actions, suits, charges and judgments whatsoever that arise out of the Subrecipient's performance or nonperformance of the services or subject matter called for in this Agreement.

C. Nondiscrimination (for agencies receiving grants in excess of $10,000)

Agencies receiving grants in excess of Ten Thousand Dollars ($10,000) shall be subject to the following provision in accordance with Section 2.21.070 of the Bloomington Municipal Code. The Agency will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, creed, religion, ancestry, national origin, sex, disability or other handicap, age, marital/familial status, or status with regard to public assistance. The Agency will take affirmative action to insure that all employment practices are free from such discrimination. Such employment practices include but are not limited to the following: hiring, upgrading, demotion, transfer, recruitment or recruitment advertising, layoff, termination, rates of pay or other forms of compensation, and selection for training, including apprenticeship. The Agency agrees to post in conspicuous places, available to employees and applicants for employment, notices to be provided by the City setting forth the provisions of this nondiscrimination clause.

DRAFT

VI. NOTICES

Communication and details concerning this contract shall be directed to the following contract representatives:

City:	Agency:

Marilyn Patterson, Program Manager Housing and Neighborhood Development City of Bloomington P.O. Box 100 Bloomington, IN 47402 Tel: (812) 349-3577 Fax: (812) 349-3582 E-mail: pattersm@bloomington.in.gov	«Director_of_Agency» «Agency_Name» «Address_1» «Address_2» Tel: «Phone_» E-mail: «Email_Address»

VII. TERMINATION OF AGREEMENT

The Agency agrees that this Agreement is subject to the availability of funds and that if funds become unavailable for the performance of this Agreement, the City may terminate the Agreement. If funds become unavailable, the City shall promptly notify the Agency in writing of the termination and the effective date thereof.

It is further agreed that the City may terminate this Agreement in whole or in part if it determines that Agency has failed to comply with the Agreement or with other conditions imposed by applicable laws, rules and regulations. The City shall promptly notify the Agency in writing of the determination and the reasons for the determination, together with the effective date. The Agency agrees that if the City terminates the Agreement for cause it will refund to the City that portion of the funds that the City determines was not expended in compliance with the Agreement. The Agency shall be responsible for paying any costs incurred by the City to collect the refund, including court costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

If any provisions of this Agreement is held invalid, the remainder of the Agreement shall not be affected thereby and all other parts of this Agreement shall nevertheless be in full force and effect.

VIII. TERM OF AGREEMENT

Unless terminated as provided in Section VII herein, this Agreement shall terminate upon the City's determination that the provisions of this Agreement regarding use of the Agreement funds have been met by the Agency.

CITY OF BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA

By: ________________________________
Chris Sturbaum
President, Common Council

By: ________________________________
Lisa Abbott

«Agency_Name»

By: __________________________________
«Pres_BoD»
President
Board of Directors

By: __________________________________
«Director_of_Agency»

DRAFT

Housing and Neighborhood Development Director	Executive Director
______________________________	______________________________
Date	Date

By: ______________________________
Mark Kruzan, Mayor

____
Date

DRAFT

Calendar for Months of March through June

March 2007

Feb 2007

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28			

Apr 2007

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
				1 11:30 AM SWMD, SWMF 5:30 PM CSW, McCloskey	2 *Payday*	3
4	5 4:30 PM Plat, Hooker 5:00 PM RC, McCloskey 5:00 PM USB, IU Research 5:30 PM BPSC-WS, Hooker 5:30 PM PC, Chambers	6 1:30 PM DRC, McCloskey 5:30 PM BPTC, Transit 5:30 PM BPW, Chambers 6:00 PM BCOS, McCloskey 7:30 PM Tele, Chambers	7 12:00 PM BUEA, McCloskey 7:30 PM CCL/RS-CW, Chambers	8 12:00 PM HN, McCloskey 3:30 PM BHPC, McCloskey	9 1:30 PM MPO-TAC/PC, McCloskey	10
11	12 12:00 PM Ord/DL	13 5:30 PM BCAC, Kelly	14 2:00 PM HO, Kelly 4:00 PM BHQA, McCloskey 4:00 PM CSBM, McCloskey	15 8:00 AM BHA, BHA 3:30 PM BMFC, Hooker	16 12:00 PM DVT, Hooker *Payday*	17
18	19 12:00 PM Res/DL 4:00 PM CCA, McCloskey 5:00 PM FMAC, Parks 5:00 PM USB, IU Research 5:30 PM BPSC, Hooker	20 3:00 PM BPS, McCloskey 3:30 PM CFRC, Hooker 5:30 PM ACC, McCloskey 5:30 PM BPTC, Transit 5:30 PM BPW, Chambers	21 9:30 AM Tree, Rosehill 4:00 PM MLKC, McCloskey 6:30 PM MPO-CAC, McCloskey 7:00 PM CONA, Hooker 7:30 PM CCL/RS, Chambers	22 5:30 PM BZA, Chambers 7:00 PM EC, McCloskey	23 12:00 PM EDC, Hooker	24
25	26 5:30 PM BHRC, McCloskey	27 4:00 PM BPC, Chambers	28 2:00 PM HO, Kelly 5:30 PM TC, Chambers 7:30 PM CCL/CW, Chambers	29	30 12:00 PM Res/DL *Payday*	31

April 2007

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
1	2 5:00 PM RC, McCloskey 5:00 PM USB, IU Research 5:30 PM BPSC-WS, Hooker	3 1:30 PM DRC, McCloskey 5:30 PM BPTC, Transit 5:30 PM BPW, Chambers 7:30 PM Tele, Chambers	4 12:00 PM BUEA, McCloskey 7:30 PM CCL/RS, Chambers	5 11:30 AM SWMD, SWMF 5:30 PM CSW, McCloskey	6 City Holiday Good Friday	7 7:00 AM BCFM, Common
8	9 12:00 PM Ord/DL 4:30 PM Plat, Hooker 5:30 PM PC, Chambers	10 5:30 PM BCAC, Kelly 6:00 PM BCOS, McCloskey	11 2:00 PM HO, Kelly 4:00 PM BHQA, McCloskey 4:00 PM CSBM, McCloskey 4:30 PM ERAC, Cascades 7:30 PM CCL/CW, Chambers	12 12:00 PM HN, McCloskey 3:30 PM BHPC, McCloskey 7:00 PM IRAC, McCloskey	13 1:30 PM MPO-TAC/PC McCloskey *Payday*	14 7:00 AM BCFM, Common
15	16 12:00 PM Res/DL 4:00 PM CCA, McCloskey 5:00 PM FMAC, Parks 5:00 PM USB, IU Research 5:30 PM BPSC, Hooker	17 3:00 PM BPS, McCloskey 3:30 PM CFRC, Hooker 5:30 PM ACC, McCloskey 5:30 PM BPTC, Transit 5:30 PM BPW, Chambers	18 9:30 AM Tree, Rosehill 4:00 PM MLKC, McCloskey 6:30 PM MPO-CAC, McCloskey 7:00 PM CONA, Hooker 7:30 PM CCL/RS, Chambers	19 8:00 AM BHA, BHA 3:30 PM BMFC, Hooker 5:30 PM BZA, Chambers 7:00 PM EC, McCloskey	20 12:00 PM DVT, Hooker	21 7:00 AM BCFM, Common
22	23 12:00 PM Ord/DL 5:30 PM BHRC, McCloskey	24 4:00 PM BPC, Chambers	25 2:00 PM HO, Kelly 5:30 PM TC, Chambers 7:30 PM CCL/CW, Chambers	26	27 12:00 PM EDC, Hooker *Payday*	28 7:00 AM BCFM, Common
29	30 12:00 PM Res/DL 5:00 PM USB, IU Research					

Mar 2007

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

May 2007

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

May 2007

Apr 2007

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
		1 1:30 PM DRC, McCloskey 5:30 PM BPTC, Transit 5:30 PM BPW, Chambers 7:30 PM Tele, Chambers	2 12:00 PM BUEA, McCloskey 7:30 PM CCL/RS, Chambers	3 11:30 AM SWMD, SWMF 5:30 PM CSW, McCloskey	4 12:00 PM Ord/DL	5 7:00 AM BCFM, Common
6	7 4:30 PM Plat, Hooker 5:00 PM RC, McCloskey 5:30 PM BPSC-WS, Hooker 5:30 PM PC, Chambers	8 City Holiday 5:30 PM BCAC, Kelly Primary Election Day	9 2:00 PM HO, Kelly 4:00 PM BHQA, McCloskey 4:00 PM CSBM, McCloskey 6:00 PM BCOS, Hooker 7:30 PM CCL/CW, Chambers	10 12:00 PM HN, McCloskey 3:30 PM BHPC, McCloskey	11 1:30 PM MPO-TAC/PC, McCloskey *Payday*	12 7:00 AM BCFM, Common 5:00 PM USB, IU Research
13	14 12:00 PM Res/DL	15 3:00 PM BPS, McCloskey 5:30 PM ACC, McCloskey 5:30 PM BPTC, Transit 5:30 PM BPW, Chambers	16 9:30 AM Tree, Rosehill 4:00 PM MLKC, McCloskey 5:30 PM CCL/BA, McCloskey 7:00 PM CONA, Hooker 7:30 PM CCL/RS, Chambers	17 8:00 AM BHA, BHA 3:30 PM BMFC, Hooker 5:30 PM BZA, Chambers 7:00 PM EC, McCloskey	18 12:00 PM DVT, Hooker	19 7:00 AM BCFM, Common
20	21 4:00 PM CCA, McCloskey 5:00 PM FMAC, Parks 5:30 PM BHRC, McCloskey 5:30 PM BPSC, Hooker	22 3:30 PM CFRC, Hooker 4:00 PM BPC, Chambers	23 12:00 PM Ord/DL 2:00 PM HO, Kelly 5:30 PM TC, Chambers 6:30 PM MPO-CAC, McCloskey 7:30 PM CCL/CW, Chambers	24	25 12:00 PM EDC, Hooker *Payday*	26 7:00 AM BCFM, Common
27	28 City Holiday Memorial Day	29 5:30 PM BPTC, Transit 5:30 PM BPW, Chambers	30	31		

Jun 2007

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

June 2007

May 2007

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

Jul 2007

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
					1	2 7:00 AM BCFM, Common
3	4 12:00 PM Res/DL 4:30 PM Plat, Hooker 5:00 PM RC, McCloskey 5:30 PM BPSC-WS, Hooker 5:30 PM PC, Chambers	5 1:30 PM DRC, McCloskey 7:30 PM Tele, Chambers	6 12:00 PM BUEA, McCloskey 2:00 PM HO, Kelly 7:30 PM CCL/RS, Chambers	7 11:30 AM SWMD, SWMF 5:30 PM CSW, McCloskey	8 1:30 PM MPO-TAC, McCloskey *Payday*	9 7:00 AM BCFM, Common
10	11 12:00 PM Ord/DL 5:00 PM USB, IU Research	12 5:30 PM BCAC, Kelly 5:30 PM BPTC, Transit 5:30 PM BPW, Chambers 6:00 PM BCOS, McCloskey	13 4:00 PM BHQA, McCloskey 4:00 PM CSBM, McCloskey 4:30 PM ERAC, Griffy 7:30 PM CCL/CW, Chambers	14 12:00 PM HN, McCloskey 3:30 PM BHPC, McCloskey 5:30 PM BZA, Chambers 7:00 PM EC, McCloskey 7:00 PM IRAC, McCloskey	15 12:00 PM DVT, Hooker	16 7:00 AM BCFM, Common
17	18 12:00 PM Res/DL 4:00 PM CCA, McCloskey 5:30 PM BPSC, Hooker 5:00 PM FMAC, Parks	19 3:00 PM BPS, McCloskey 3:30 PM CFRC, Hooker 5:30 PM ACC, McCloskey	20 9:30 AM Tree, Rosehill 2:00 PM HO, Kelly 4:00 PM MLKC, McCloskey 6:30 PM MPO-CAC, McCloskey 7:00 PM CONA, Hooker 7:30 PM CCL/RS, Chambers	21 8:00 AM BHA, BHA 3:30 PM BMFC, Hooker	22 12:00 PM EDC, Hooker *Payday*	23 7:00 AM BCFM, Common
24	25 5:00 PM USB, IU Research 5:30 PM BHRC, McCloskey	26 4:00 PM BPC, Chambers 5:30 PM BPTC, Transit 5:30 PM BPW, Chambers	27 12:00 PM Ord/DL 12:00 PM Res/DL 5:30 PM TC, Chambers 7:30 PM CCL/CW, Chambers	28	29	30 7:00 AM BCFM, Common